



OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES & SURVEYS
SOCIAL SURVEY DIVISION

The Drunken Offender in Britain

by

H. D. Willcock

*Drawn out on behalf of the Home Office
and the Scottish Home and Health Department*

SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Date of Issue

13. OCT. 1980

SOUTHAMPTON
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

BOOK NUMBER	79-154123
CLASS MARK	q HN 385.5 (in box)

79154123

TELEPEN



The Drunken Offender in Britain

by

H. D. Willcock

A survey of persons charged with offences of drunkenness, and of drunken persons charged with other offences of similar seriousness.

Carried out by the Social Survey Division, Office of Population Censuses and Surveys for the Home Office and the Scottish Home and Health Department.



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
PART I Introduction; and report on THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT compared with the REST OF ENGLAND AND WALES	
FOREWORD	ix
SUMMARY	1
I BACKGROUND AND METHOD	25
II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR	34
III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKENNESS OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES	58
IV CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT	108
APPENDIX I	129
APPENDIX II	135
APPENDIX III	140
APPENDIX IVa	141
APPENDIX IVb	143
APPENDIX V	145
APPENDIX VI	146
 PART II SCOTLAND, compared with ENGLAND AND WALES OUTSIDE THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT	
INDEX AND NOTES ON INTERPRETATION	A-C
SUMMARY	155
I BACKGROUND	173
II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR	179
III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKEN OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES	201
IV THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT	237
APPENDIX I	257
APPENDIX II	261



Part I

The Drunkenness Offender in England and Wales



INDEX

	<i>Page</i>
FOREWORD	ix
SUMMARY	1
I BACKGROUND AND METHOD	
i Origin and Purpose	25
ii Method	25
iii Reason for considering the Metropolitan Police District separately from the rest of England and Wales	27
iv Trends in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales, and possible effects of this inquiry on the number of charges made	28
v The Samples	
a Distribution by type of Force and between the Inner and Outer MPD	30
b Distribution by age, within each type of force...	31
c Distribution by sex, within each type of force	32
II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR	
i The Principal Charges	34
ii Degree of Incapacity	35
iii The Nature of Aggravating Behaviour (detail)	38
iv Behaviour (main types) and Capability	43
v Degree of Capability and Nature of Behaviour	47
vi Behaviour associated with charges of aggravated drunkenness only	48
vii Aggravating behaviour reported of those charged with simple drunkenness only	49
viii Behaviour associated with charges other than charges of drunkenness	50
ix Behaviour associated with drunkenness charges, and with other charges against intoxicated persons	52
x Charges other than charges of drunkenness	57

	<i>Page</i>
III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKENNESS OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES	
i Sex	58
ii Age	61
iii Sex, age and charge	66
iv Marital status	69
v Residential status	70
vi Country of birth	71
vii Employment status and country of birth	79
viii Number of persons involved: the solitary London offender ...	82
ix Physical injury and personal material loss	87
x Carrying and using weapons	90
xi Medical treatment known to the police	91
xii Previous convictions known to the local police	91
xiii Celebrations	95
xiv Type of drink consumed	97
 IV CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT	
i Time of day of the incident... ..	108
ii Day of the week	111
iii Place of incident	113
iv The officers who intervene in incidents which lead to charges ...	117
v Officers' duties at the time of intervention, how an officer first came to be present, and behaviour related to source of information about the incident	120
APPENDIX I The form completed by the Police	129
APPENDIX II Instructions on completing "Incident Report" forms... ..	135
APPENDIX III Police Forces in England and Wales, and Sub-Divisions of the Metropolitan Police Force included in the samples	140
APPENDIX IVa Full descriptions of behaviour appearing on form and subsequent grouping	141
APPENDIX IVb Full descriptions of charges appearing on form, and subsequent grouping	143
APPENDIX V Table 12(A): Behaviour (detail). A Table based on the whole of the samples from each area, including those who showed no aggravating behaviour. ...	145
APPENDIX VI The Offences of Drunkenness covered by this Inquiry	146

FOREWORD

Description

This enquiry was conducted on behalf of the Home Office by the Government Social Survey with the aid of the Police. A quarter of the sub-divisions of the Metropolitan Police Force, and half of the provincial Forces participated, by completing a standard form for each person charged with an offence of drunkenness during a period of eighteen months. The information relating to those charged in the provincial forces covers the period from November 1964 until April 1966, and that for the Metropolitan Police Force the period from May 1965 until October 1966.

Objects

The main object of the enquiry was to obtain information about the characteristics of those charged with offences of drunkenness, their behaviour and condition, in order to reach a better understanding of the social problems presented by these offenders.

If the annual increases in the number of convictions for these offences which characterised the years 1960-62 had continued, the results might have yielded still more useful information about the nature of such charges and their origins (in changes in police methods and/or in the behaviour and other characteristics of the offenders themselves). In the event, the number of drunkenness offences proved in the courts declined each year from 1963 till 1966. This reversal of the statistical trend inhibited the enquiry in its effort to discover the reasons for the nature of the behaviour which had earlier led to large and increasing numbers of drunkenness offences. At the same time, it is thought that the report contains interesting and useful material on the special characteristics of those involved in these types of offences.

Police Practice

There was a slight increase, common to all types of force (city, borough, county and MPD), in the use of motorised patrols in apprehending drunkenness offenders during the period of the enquiry.

Motorised patrols were most commonly used in response to complaints by publicans, managements and members of the public; but there was no consistent change in the proportion of incidents on licensed premises.

In general, comparison between the results for the first and last six months of the enquiry period (i.e. the same six calendar months in two consecutive years) present no firm evidence that changes in police practice were affecting the statistics.

Some Outstanding Results

Area of the Offence. In the period covered by this enquiry and the years immediately preceding it about two-fifths of all offences of drunkenness proved in England and Wales were the outcome of incidents within the Metropolitan Police District. The report compares the characteristics of the London offenders with those of offenders in the rest of the country.

In the present writer's opinion, the following are among the more outstanding results:—

National origin. Over 40% of London offenders, and about 16% of offenders in the rest of the country were born in Ireland. Less than a third of London offenders were English born: more than two-thirds of those charged in the rest of England and Wales offended in their country of birth.

Status. Nearly a quarter (23%) of London offenders, and about half this proportion (12%) in the rest of the country were persons of no fixed abode.

In both areas 22–23% of offenders were unemployed. In London an additional 12%, and in the rest of the country an additional 5%, were casual or seasonal workers.

Persons in regular employment who committed their offence in their country of birth were in a minority—most markedly so in London. 44% of offenders in England outside the MPD fell into this category; 34% of offenders in Wales; 21% in Outer London; and 12% in Inner London.

Age. Nearly half of the London offenders were aged 40 or more, compared with a little over one-third of offenders in the rest of the country. Persons aged 18–24 accounted for only half as many of the offenders in London (15%) as they did in the rest of the country (30%).

The older the offender, the more likely he was to be wholly or partially incapable, and the more incapable the more likely he was to be on his own.

The majority of offenders in both areas were on their own at the time of police intervention, but the London offender was characteristically more likely to be solitary, middle-aged or elderly and to a lesser or greater degree incapacitated.

The report discusses in detail these and other characteristics of the offenders in relation to their behaviour and the nature of the charge(s) brought against them. The circumstances of the incident, in such terms as time and place, how the police came to be present, the use made of motorised patrols, etc. are also discussed.

* * * * *

An inquiry using the same methods was carried out in half the police forces in Scotland at the same time as that in England and Wales outside the MPD. This is reported on separately in Part 2 of this report, which compares the drunken offender in Scotland with his counterpart in England and Wales outside the MPD. The reasons for reporting separately on Scotland, and confining the comparisons to that part of England and Wales outside the Metropolitan Police District are explained in the second part of the report.

SUMMARY

I BACKGROUND AND METHOD

1. **Charges with which the enquiry is concerned.** The enquiry concerns all offences of drunkenness other than offences under Sections 6 and 11 of the Road Traffic Act 1960 (drunk in charge etc. of road vehicles). These are the offences embodied in the statistics for the number of offences of drunkenness proved which is prepared by the Home Office each year, and published annually by H.M.S.O.

2. In addition information was obtained about certain "borderline" groups—(a) those against whom a charge sometimes used as an *alternative* to one of drunkenness was made (e.g. a charge under a bye-law); and (b) those intoxicated persons charged only with an offence other than one of drunkenness, if, in the opinion of the police the actual charge would have given way to a drunkenness charge had the person concerned been *more* drunk. These two groups together constitute 3 to 4% of the sample in the Metropolitan Police District and in the rest of England and Wales, respectively.

3. **Method.** A sample of 25% of the sub-divisions of the Metropolitan Police Force was drawn, together with one of 50% of the Police Forces in the rest of England and Wales. Within each of the selected sub-divisions, and forces, a form (reproduced in Appendix I) was completed by the police in respect of each person charged with any of the types of offence described above, during a period of eighteen months. Outside the MPD this period ran from November 1964 until April 1966, inclusive. Owing to boundary changes coinciding with the formation of the Greater London Council, the starting date was postponed in the MPD, where the enquiry lasted from May 1965 till October 1966, inclusive.

4. **Sample.** The method of sampling is described in the text, and the distribution of the sample of alleged drunkenness offenders is shown to correspond closely with the most nearly comparable national figures for persons found guilty of drunkenness offences in respect of distribution by type of force (city, borough and county) outside the MPD; distribution between the "Inner" and "Outer" areas of the MPD; distribution by age and sex within each type of force outside the MPD, and by age and sex in the MPD as a whole. Statistics were not readily available to enable an analysis to be made of the actual distribution by age and sex within the two areas of the MPD, which were defined for operational purposes as consisting of those sub-divisions lying in part or in whole within a five-mile radius of Charing Cross (the "Inner" area), and the remaining sub-divisions (the "Outer" area).^{*} (Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8)

^{*}0.6% and 0.7% of persons proceeded against on charges of simple drunkenness and drunkenness with aggravations, and against whom proceedings were completed, in 1965 and 1966, had the charge against them withdrawn or dismissed. (Source: *Criminal Statistics for England and Wales 1965 and 1966*. Table 1a, offences 140 and 141. H.M.S.O. Cmds. 3037 and 3332). Although this research concerns all those charged, regardless of the outcome, the drunkenness charges are likely to be found proved in all but a negligible proportion of cases.

The size of the samples obtained (inclusive of the "borderline cases" mentioned in paragraph 2 above) were 13,711 in the Metropolitan Police District and 34,597 in the rest of England and Wales.

5. **Presentation.** In this report we contrast the alleged offenders in the MPD with those in the rest of England and Wales.

The Metropolitan Police are in the special position of being a single Police Authority within whose borders about 40% of all drunkenness offences proved in England and Wales occur. (Table 2)

Interim analyses of key items made at six-monthly intervals while this enquiry was in progress showed that the alleged offenders in the MPD differed greatly in many respects from those in the rest of England and Wales. It appeared that to consider the two areas separately would be more profitable than to present results for the whole country during the twelve-month period during which the enquiries coincided in time.

II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR

6. **Degree of manifest intoxication.** Persons charged in the Metropolitan Police District tended to be in a much more advanced stage of manifest intoxication than those charged in the rest of England and Wales:

In the MPD 68% were charged with simple drunkenness only; 63% showed no form of aggravating behaviour at all; and 47% were rated by the police as totally or nearly totally incapable—a state defined by example as "flat out; unconscious or asleep; unable to remain upright without support". (Tables 9 and 10)*

In the rest of England and Wales the corresponding figures were: 36% charged with simple drunkenness; 34% showing no form of aggravating behaviour; 30% rated as totally or nearly totally incapable. Outside London 34% were rated as not even partially incapable—the great majority of them not even incoherent or with heavily slurred speech. The corresponding figure for the MPD was 9%, about equally divided between those who were incoherent and those who were not.

7. **Degree of intoxication in relation to charge.** In the MPD 98% of those charged with simple drunkenness were stated to be at least partially incapable (i.e. at least in a state of tottering, staggering, needing support at intervals, lurching into the roadway etc.); 80% of those charged with aggravated drunkenness had at least reached this stage; and 64% of those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence.

The corresponding figures for the three types of offence in the rest of England and Wales were 99%; 49% and 43%. (Table 11)

The London offender charged either with aggravated drunkenness or drunkenness at the same time as another offence tends to be manifestly less in control of his actions than is his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales.

8. **Aggravating behaviour.** A few persons charged only with an offence of simple drunkenness (both those in the MPD, and in the rest of England and Wales) do show some aggravating behaviour, but this is largely confined to behaviour

*The figures for "no aggravating behaviour" derive from Appendix V, Table 12A.

which in the nature of things cannot be controlled (urinating; vomiting); or which can be construed as a nuisance or inconvenience to the public rather than in any sense a threat.

9. The most common forms of aggravating behaviour are listed below. The percentages refer to those showing any form of aggravating behaviour, and within this group to those showing one or more of the different forms of behaviour falling within each of the broad categories listed. The component parts of these categories are discussed shortly. (*Detailed analysis: Table 12*)

	% of those showing any form of aggravating behaviour	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
General "public nuisance" behaviour	46	35
Insulting language or behaviour	21	47
Vomiting or urinating	19	11
Physical violence	14	24
Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence)	10	18
Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult)	6	10
Damage to property	4	10
Petty theft and minor fraud	1	2
Sexual behaviour	2	1

10. General "public nuisance" behaviour. This is behaviour which may inconvenience or annoy the public but is unlikely to be perceived as in any way threatening. It consists principally of rowdiness or horseplay by drunks amongst themselves or alone. A small part of the behaviour so defined consists of deliberately obstructing the roadway or footpath, or pushing and jostling members of the public.

This is the most common form of aggravating behaviour in the MPD, and is (in both areas) associated with a lesser degree of capability* than any other form of behaviour apart from urinating or vomiting. It is not only the commonest general form of behaviour in the MPD, but includes a higher proportion of simple rowdiness and horseplay, and less obstruction and jostling, than it does in the rest of the country.

11. Insulting language or behaviour. Insulting behaviour is defined as addressing insulting, derogatory or mocking remarks to strangers which are not threatening or aggressive, and not obscene. The rest of this group consists of annoying but inoffensive remarks to strangers, obscene language within the offenders own group, and directed to strangers; and any form of offensive language directed at the police. It will be noticed that the whole group consists of verbal behaviour only.

This is the most common form of behaviour outside the MPD, and the second most common in the MPD. *Its predominance outside the MPD is principally accounted for by the much higher incidence of offensive language directed at the police (reported of 26% of those offenders showing aggravating behaviour outside the MPD, but of only 6% in the MPD), and, to a lesser extent, to the greater incidence of obscene language.*

*A "mean capability score" was calculated from the four-point scale used by the police in rating the degree of incapability of the alleged offender.

12. **Urinating and vomiting.** This is the third most common type of aggravating behaviour in the MPD, and is nearly twice as common there, amongst those showing any aggravating behaviour, than it is in the rest of England and Wales. It is the form of behaviour most closely associated with a low degree of capability in both areas.

13. **Physical violence.** This consists principally of fighting or violence confined to the offender's own group, and of resisting attempts by publicans and managements to eject from, or refuse entry to, any premises other than a private dwelling. Fighting and attacks on strangers are a small component.

This form of behaviour is associated with, on average, the highest degree of capability of any of the main types of behaviour, and is much less common amongst those showing any aggravating behaviour in the MPD than it is amongst those in the rest of the country.

14. **Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence.** This is a fairly uncommon form of behaviour, more uncommon amongst those showing aggravating behaviour in the MPD than in the rest of England and Wales. Threatening behaviour is more often directed at strangers than at members of the offender's own group. It is a less common form of aggravating behaviour in the MPD than it is in the rest of England and Wales, and is associated in both areas with a fairly high degree of capability.

15. **Obstructing the Police (excluding verbal insult etc).** The main component item in the MPD is obstruction in the form of resisting arrest. In the rest of England and Wales this is also the largest component item, but attacks on the police by alleged drunkenness offenders neither in the course of resisting arrest, nor in the course of trying to "rescue" someone else are more common than they are in the MPD. The degree of capability of those drunks obstructing the police tends to be fairly high, but its rating on the scale of capability differs between the MPD and the rest of the country. Among those showing any aggravating behaviour, nearly twice as many obstructed the police outside London as did so in London.

16. **Damage to Property.** The great majority of damage reported is regarded by the police as deliberate. Damage is reported less than half as frequently of those showing aggravating behaviour in London than outside it. Damage tends to be associated with a fairly high degree of capability.

17. **Petty theft and minor fraud.** The main component item is refusal or neglect to pay bills or fares. Theft in the more conventional sense is extremely rare—shoplifting, theft of "souvenirs", pocket-picking and other miscellaneous theft together were recorded against less than 1% of those showing aggravating behaviour.

18. **Sexual behaviour.** This was very infrequently reported. The behaviour consists mainly of accosting persons of the opposite sex, but in about one-third of the small number of cases reported a person of the same sex as the alleged offender was accosted.

Other forms of sexual behaviour were *extremely* uncommon. It appears that alleged drunkenness offenders practically never behave indecently.

19. **Neglecting children.** Consists of being drunk in charge of a child, and any other instance of child neglect or leaving children unattended. Behaviour in this category was reported of only 0.2% and 0.3% of those showing aggravating behaviour in either area.

* * * * *

20. The above discussion concerns all those showing aggravating behaviour, regardless of the charge against them. Separate results are given in the text for those charged with simple drunkenness, with aggravated drunkenness only, with drunkenness at the same time as another offence, and with non-drunkenness offences only (the "borderline cases" referred to in paragraph 2 of this summary). *Tables 17, 18 and 19*

21. **Behaviour most likely to be associated with a second (or alternative) charge.** The greater part of all aggravating behaviour is encompassed in the single offence of aggravated drunkenness*. 2% of alleged offenders in the MPD and 12% in the rest of England and Wales were charged with an additional offence as well as one of drunkenness, and rather less than 4% in each area fell into the "borderline" group. (*Table 20*)

22. Considering these last two groups together, and excluding the very rare types of behaviour, there are three sorts of behaviour which were associated with a second or alternative charge in the majority of cases in both areas.†

- i Attacks on police officers, not forming part of an attempt to resist arrest, or to "rescue" someone else.
- ii Deliberate damage to property.
- iii Attempts to rescue someone else from arrest.

23. There are five forms of behaviour which were associated with a second charge in only a minority of cases, but in *at least 25%* of cases in one or both areas.

- i Attempts to resist own arrest.
- ii Fighting, physical violence or attacks on strangers.
- iii Resisting attempts by publicans, managements etc. to eject or refuse entry to premises.
- iv Accidental damage to property.
- v Accosting person of the same sex.

24. There are four forms of behaviour which were associated with a second charge in less than 25% of cases in either area, but in *at least 15%* in one or both areas—

- i Obscene language directed to strangers.
- ii Obscene, indecent or offensive language directed at the police.
- iii Fighting or physical violence confined to own group.
- iv Accosting person of opposite sex.

*In the MPD 67% of alleged offenders in the sample were charged with simple drunkenness and 27% with aggravated drunkenness only; in the rest of England and Wales the corresponding figures were 36% and 48%. A total of 94% in the MPD, and 84% in the rest of the country were thus charged only with an offence of drunkenness.

†Behaviour yielding less than 25 cases in the MPD is excluded from consideration here. Police were asked to distinguish between items of behaviour leading to a drunkenness charge and those leading to a second or alternative charge.

25. *Charges other than drunkenness charges.* The most common non-drunkenness charge in the MPD was one of disorderly or unruly behaviour (or a similar offence under a bye-law). Such charges were made against 2.7% of the sample in the MPD and 2.0% in the rest of England and Wales. Apart from this, the most common non-drunkenness charges, and the only single charges brought against as many as 1% of the sample in either area were—(Table 21)

	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
	%	%
Malicious or wilful damage	0.9	5.2
Assault on police	0.6	3.2
Indecent or obscene language	0.2	1.2
Refusal to quit licensed premises, etc.	0.2	1.0

26. *Other more serious charges*

- i *Wounding and assault charges* (excluding assaults on the police, on spouse or relative, and indecent assaults) were made against 0.1% of the sample in the MPD and 0.7% in the rest of England and Wales. Charges of assault where the person assaulted was a spouse or relative were alleged as a separate offence against less than 0.05% in the MPD and 0.1% elsewhere. There were practically no charges of indecent assault (none at all in the MPD; less than 0.05% elsewhere).
- ii *Possessing an offensive weapon.* 0.1% and 0.5% were charged with this offence in the two areas, respectively.
- iii *Obstructing the police.* 0.1% and 0.6% were charged with this offence in the two areas respectively.

27. *Drunkenness as a mitigating factor.* If drunkenness may be pleaded in mitigation we should expect a charge of drunkenness to be added, if it were tenable, to more serious charges. In the MPD 23%, and in the rest of England and Wales 46% of those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence were rated by the police as neither incapable nor incoherent. These proportions are considerably higher than they are for those charged with aggravated drunkenness only (9% and 38%). This suggests that the police do, in fact, tend to add a charge of drunkenness though an offender is not ostentatiously drunk, if he is intoxicated and faced with a more serious charge. (Table 11)

III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKENNESS OFFENDERS

(i) Sex

28. In the Outer MPD 7% of those charged with simple drunkenness, 4% of those charged with aggravated drunkenness, and 2% of those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence were women. Much the same distribution was found in the rest of England and Wales, but in the Inner MPD more offenders were women and the distribution by type of charge was reversed—with 8%, 9% and 11% of offenders in the above three categories being women. (Table 22)

29. In the MPD as a whole the distribution by degree of capability of women was almost identical to that among men. In the rest of England and Wales,

women offenders were much more often rated as totally or nearly totally incapable (40%) than were men (29%); and the women were also less often rated as neither incapable nor incoherent than were the men. (Table 23)

30. In the Inner MPD women and men were equally prone to show some form of aggravating behaviour. The women charged were *more* prone than the men to use insulting language or to indulge in general "public nuisance" behaviour. (Table 24)

31. In the Outer MPD the women were more likely than the men charged to show no aggravating behaviour at all, but were nevertheless more likely to use insulting language.

32. If we compare only those who show aggravating behaviour of some sort in the two areas, the outstanding difference is the greater propensity of women offenders to use insulting language. Also:—

i Women who show aggravating behaviour are not quite so likely as men to damage property or obstruct the police. The differences are slight, but are common to both areas.

ii The women who show aggravating behaviour are less likely to use physical violence or threats than are the men. (Table 25)

(ii) Age

33. Alleged offenders tend to be older in the MPD than in the rest of England and Wales. Only about 15%* were under the age of 25 in the MPD, compared with 34% elsewhere. At least 40% in the MPD were between the ages of 40 and 59, compared with 29% elsewhere. (Table 26)

34. Very young offenders, aged under 25, made up about 12% of the whole in the Inner MPD, 23% in the Outer MPD, and 30% in the rest of England and Wales. (Table 27)

35. Outside the MPD the contribution of young people declined progressively with each year of age from eighteen to 24. At the extremes, 6.3% of alleged offenders were 18 years old, and 2.0% were 24 years old.

36. This trend might well be explained in terms of a progression from the first year of legitimate drinking in public houses, through a period of growing accustomed to drink, and then reaching the early period of marriage.

37. However there was no systematic yearly age trend at all in the MPD, and both in the Inner and the Outer areas the 18-year olds made the *smallest* contribution to the total for any year of age between 18 and 24.

38. Age and Incapacity. Both in the MPD and outside it under-age offenders (the 13 to 17 year olds) were more prone to total or near-total incapacity than were the 18 to 19 year olds, or the 20 to 24 year olds. (Table 28)

*No information on the alleged offenders age was recorded by the police in 5% of cases in the MPD (1% in the rest of England and Wales). Percentages quoted are based on the whole of the samples, including those for whom information on age was not available. Comparisons are therefore approximations.

39. Outside the MPD, the proportion of offenders who were rated as totally or nearly totally incapable increased progressively and steeply with age from the age of 18 to 19 upwards. Eight age-groups were considered:— the under 18 year olds; the 18 to 19 year olds; the two subsequent five year groups up to the age of 29; three ten year groups up to the age of 69; and those aged 70 and over. There was an increase of 3% (from 11% to 14%) between the ages of 18–19 and 20–24. Thereafter, with each successive group the increase ranged from +8% to +15%. The 25 to 29 year group contained nearly twice as great a proportion who were "flat out" (21%) as did the 18–19 year olds (11%); the 40–49 year olds included nearly twice as high a proportion (40%) as did the 20–29 year olds; the proportion rose to considerably more than half (59%) among the 60 to 69 year olds, and to three-quarters (74%) among those aged 70 or over.

40. This trend was very much less marked in the MPD, with differences of only 2% to 6% between consecutive groups after the age of 19, compared with 8% to 15% in the rest of the country. About one-third of those aged 18 to 19 were in a state of total or near total incapability, and the proportion rose slowly to about half of those aged 40 to 49. From the age of 50 onwards, the likelihood of an offender in the MPD being "flat out" was about the same or rather less than it was in the rest of England and Wales.

41. No simple explanation can be offered for this trend, which is consistent with several hypotheses. The explanation might lie in a declining tolerance for alcohol with advancing years. Alternatively no more might be implied than the fact that the older people get, the less likely they are to indulge in riotous or disorderly behaviour (whether drunk or not)—consequently if they commit an offence of drunkenness at all it becomes increasingly likely with advancing years that it will be one associated with incapacity rather than disorderliness.

42. *Charges. Contribution of the Young.* In the MPD persons aged under 25 made up 11% of those charged with simple drunkenness, 21% of those charged with aggravated drunkenness, and 27% of those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence. (*Table 30*)

43. Outside the MPD, the corresponding figures are 15%, 41% and 41%—i.e. two-fifths of charges, other than charges of simple drunkenness, were made against persons aged under 25.

44. Outside the MPD the under 25's made up about half of all those charged with disorderliness or damage to property, and 60% of all those charged with obstructing the police. The tendency for these charges to be concentrated more than others among the young was repeated, but was less marked, in the MPD.

45. *Sex, age and charge.* Only 5% of female offenders in the MPD were under the age of 25, compared with 16% of the male offenders. In the rest of England and Wales 21% of female offenders and 35% of male offenders were aged under 25. (*Table 32*)

46. This age group among males in the MPD makes up 12% of male simple drunkenness offenders; 23% of males charged with aggravated drunkenness; and 27% of male drunks facing other charges. Females in the age-group contribute 4%, 6% and 9% of all females charged with the three types of offence, respectively.

47. A similar but more marked trend occurs in the rest of England and Wales, where the overall contribution of the under-25's is greater—males in this age-group contribute 16%, 43% and 53% to the three types of charge amongst male offenders. Females in the age-group contribute 13%, 28% and 34% to the three types of charge among female offenders.

48. At the opposite end of the age scale, the contribution of males aged 55 and over to all charges against males were, in the MPD, 14%, 8% and 5% for the three types of offence; 18%, 5% and 3% in the rest of England and Wales. (Table 32)

49. Among those of each sex the tendency is thus for the very young to make their greatest contribution to the more serious charges, and for the elderly to make their greatest contribution to the less serious type of charge.

(iii) Marital Status

50. No information on the marital status of the alleged offender was obtained by the police in 18% of cases in the MPD and 7% in the rest of England and Wales. There was no systematic difference in the omission-rates with degree of incapacity, as might be expected if omissions were due to the length of time which must elapse before the information could be elicited, and consequent organisational problems in the police station. There appears to have been some reluctance on the part of the police to ask drunks about their marital status, perhaps because the question might be construed as a threat to inform the spouses of married people of their husband or wife's condition.

51. Assuming omissions to be randomly distributed, then 61% of offenders were single, 32%-33% married, and 6%-7% were widowed, separated or divorced, in both areas. (Table 33)

52. Not surprisingly, since degree of incapacity has been shown to increase with age, married offenders were more often stated to be highly incapable than were single offenders, and rather more of the married than of the single offenders were charged with simple drunkenness only.

(iv) Residential Status

53. The majority of all alleged offenders (56% in the MPD and 60% in the rest of England and Wales) were permanent residents in the area of the reporting police force, and 11% were temporary residents. (Table 34)

54. There were two differences between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales—

(a) 23% of alleged offenders in the MPD were persons of no fixed abode, compared with 12% in the rest of England and Wales. The difference is entirely attributable to the preponderance of persons of no fixed abode in the Inner MPD.

(b) 5% of alleged offenders in the MPD, but 15% in the rest of England and Wales were normally resident outside the area of the reporting force.

55. The Metropolitan Police District, of course, covers a greater area than that covered by the majority of other police authorities, and this must largely account for the difference described under (b) above. Nonetheless it is of interest that persons normally resident outside the area account for as few as 5% of offenders in the MPD. The contribution of day-visitors to drunkenness offenders in London is small.

56. *Charges.* The outstanding feature both in the MPD and outside it, was the differing contribution of persons of no fixed abode to the three main types of offence. In the MPD 25% of those charged with simple drunkenness, 21% of those charged with aggravated drunkenness, and 14% of those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence were persons of no fixed abode. The corresponding proportions in the rest of England and Wales were 18% 9% and 7%. (Table 35)

(v) *Country of Birth*

57. Only 28% of those charged in the Inner MPD were English by birth, and only 35% of those charged in the Outer areas. This compares with 68% native-born in the rest of England and Wales*. (Table 36)

58. The difference is very largely attributable to the high proportions of Irish-born—mainly Southern Irish—among those charged in both the Inner (40%) and the Outer (42%) MPD. The proportion of those charged in the rest of England and Wales who were Irish-born was 16%.†

59. The Scottish-born also contributed rather more to the total (11%) in the MPD than they did in the rest of England and Wales (8%).

60. The Welsh-born charged outside their country of birth contributed nearly 2% to the offenders in the MPD, and a little over 1% to offenders in the rest of England and Wales.

61. The overall contribution of others born on the continent of Europe was rather more than 3% in the MPD, and rather less than 3% elsewhere. The Polish-born in the MPD constituted over half of all alleged offenders born on the European continent, but appreciable less than half in the rest of England and Wales.

62. Those born in the Asian countries made up just under 1% of all offenders in both areas, and slightly more than half these offenders were of Indian birth (less than a quarter were Pakistan-born).

63. 2½% of offenders in the MPD, but less than ½% of offenders in the rest of England and Wales were born in the West Indies.

64. The behaviour of those born in different countries was compared. No outstanding differences were found which were consistent between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales. (Table 37)

*i.e. English-born people charged in England, or Welsh-born charged in Wales.

†The percentages quoted refer to the whole of Ireland.

65. **Type of charge.** In the MPD the uniformity in the behaviour patterns of persons from the main countries concerned is reflected in a uniformity of the distribution of charges. Natives of each of the four countries in the United Kingdom, of Eire, and of the rest of the European continent all include $69 \pm 2\%$ charged with simple drunkenness; $28 \pm 1\%$ charged with aggravated drunkenness; and 2% charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence. (Table 38)

Those born outside Europe, however, tended appreciable more than others to be charged with aggravated drunkenness (37%).

66. Outside the MPD, behaviour varied rather more with country of birth, as also did the distribution by nature of charge and by degree of incapacity.

67. The best single indicator is probably the differences in the proportions of those from the principal countries concerned who were charged with simple drunkenness only*.

% of all persons outside the MPD
charged with an offence of drunkenness
who were charged with simple
drunkenness only

	%
English born	32
Born outside Europe	40
Born in Wales	42
Born in Scotland	47
Born in Eire	47
Born in the European continent	49
Born in Northern Ireland	50

68. Among the minorities who contributed little to the sum total of offenders, the West Indian and African born were particularly liable to charges of aggravated drunkenness.

(vi) Employment status and place of birth

69. For present purposes unemployment was so defined as to include those who had lost a job within 0-3 days of the incident leading to a charge, and had not yet found, or not yet started work on, another job. The purpose of extending the definition to include these persons—not yet entitled to unemployment benefit—was to include among those classified as “unemployed” all who were in between two jobs, even though the interval might be a very short one on the day they became drunk and allegedly committed an offence. (Table 40)

70. In the Inner MPD, at least† 25% of offenders were unemployed at the time of the incident, and at least 13% were casual or seasonal workers. The corresponding proportions in the Outer MPD were substantially lower in both cases (15% unemployed; 9% casual or seasonal workers). In the MPD as a whole the proportion who were unemployed (23%) was approximately the same as it was in the rest of England and Wales, but there were more casual and seasonal workers (12%) among offenders in the MPD than there were outside it (5%).

*These proportions are based on those offenders who were alleged to have committed offences of drunkenness, and exclude the small minority of “borderline” cases referred to elsewhere.

†Proportions quoted are likely to be slightly lower than the true figures since no information on employment status was obtained by the police in respect of 8% of offenders in the MPD and 3% in the rest of England and Wales. Percentages in paragraphs 70 to 77 are based on the total samples, including those about whom information was not available.

71. Retired persons constituted 2-3% of offenders in each area. Other minority groups included seamen (assumedly on shore leave)—2% in the MPD and 4% in the rest of England and Wales—and a very small number of members of H.M. Forces (again assumedly on leave since they were not turned over to the military authorities).

72. 44% in the MPD, and 58% in the rest of England and Wales were manual workers. 9% in the MPD and 4% outside it were in other employment, or were housewives.

73. Charges: Manual workers in regular employment in both areas contributed disproportionately to their numbers to the more serious of the three main types of charge. In both areas they also tended to contribute disproportionately to the additional more serious non-drunkness charges. Manual workers outside the MPD who constituted 58% of all offenders, make up between 69% and 70% of those charged with assault, possessing an offensive weapon, and obstructing the police.* (Table 41)

74. Unemployed; seasonal workers; retired people. These three groups all show similar trends. Together they constitute 38% of all offenders in the MPD, and in the rest of England and Wales, 29%. In the MPD they contributed 40%, 37% and 32% to all those charged with each of the three main types of offence; 37%, 26% and 24% in the rest of England and Wales. Outside London they contributed least to specific charges indicative of violence: obstructing the police; assault; and carrying an offensive weapon (a fifth or less of such charges were attributable to this group).

75. Regularity of employment and country of birth. The samples were divided into two groups: those in irregular or no employment at the time of the alleged offence, and those in regular employment of any sort.

- Of those whose offence took place in England, but outside the MPD, 44% were in regular employment and English-born.
- Of those whose offence took place in Wales, 34% were in regular employment and Welsh-born.
- Of those whose offence took place in the MPD, 14% were in regular employment and English-born. In the Inner MPD the proportion was only 12% compared with 21% in the outer area.

76. Thus only a minority of alleged offenders in any of the areas named above were people in a regular job who committed their offence in their country of birth. The minority was outstandingly small in the MPD.

(vii) Number of persons involved; the solitary London offender

77. 86% of all alleged offenders in the MPD, and 67% in the rest of England and Wales, were alone at the time of the incident. That is they were not accompanied by any other person, whether charged or not. (Table 42)

78. The likelihood of being unaccompanied varied with the charge, behaviour, and the degree of capability of the offender. (Tables 42, 43, 44)

*The numbers charged in these ways in the MPD are too small for comparisons to be meaningful, except for those obstructing the police, 52% of whom were manual workers, compared with 44% of the sample as a whole.

79. Of those charged with simple drunkenness, 94% in the Inner MPD, 88% in the Outer MPD, and 91% in the rest of England and Wales were unaccompanied. 94%, 85% and 91% of those rated by the police as being totally or nearly totally incapable were solitaires.

80. For the two other main charges, the likelihood of the offender being alone was greatest in Inner London, rather less in Outer London, and markedly less in the rest of England and Wales. Of those charged with aggravated drunkenness 79%, 62% and 56% were alone in these three areas, respectively. The corresponding figures for those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence were 72%, 61% and 46%.

81. The same pattern was found in relation to those rated as partially incapable (86%, 77% and 67% being unaccompanied in the three areas, respectively); and in respect of those rated as only incoherent (74%, 65% and 56%). Even those rated as neither incapable nor incoherent were more often on their own in London (54% and 55% in the Inner and Outer areas) than they were in the rest of England and Wales (43%).

82. The London offender, especially in the Inner area of the MPD, was, regardless of his condition, more likely to be on his own, at the time of the incident than were offenders in the rest of England and Wales.

83. 94% of all offenders in Inner London, 90% in Outer London and 78% in the rest of England and Wales were the only person charged as a result of the incident in which they were involved. Most of the rest were charged as the result of an incident in which only two persons were charged. (Table 45)

84. *Behaviour.* Apart from those showing no aggravating behaviour—who are unlikely to be charged at all if they are accompanied by someone capable of taking them home—drunks using insulting language were (with the exception of those urinating or vomiting) the group most usually on their own. Those showing aggressive behaviour or using physical violence were the most likely to be accompanied. There was a consistent tendency, in respect of those showing each type of behaviour, for the proportion of solitary drunks to be greater in the Inner MPD than the outer and (with the exception of urination) for the proportion to be greater in the outer MPD than in the rest of England and Wales. Rather surprisingly, the majority of those indulging in general "public nuisance" behaviour were stated to be on their own at the time of police intervention. (Table 43)

85. If a person charged with aggravated drunkenness was accompanied, the likelihood of one or more of his companions being charged as well was high. (Table 46)

86. *Interpretation.* The reason for the solitude of the simple drunkenness offender is self-evident, but only partly explains the greater solitude of all offenders in the MPD, compared with those in the rest of England and Wales; or the very frequent solitude at the time of police intervention, of those indulging in behaviour (such as general "public nuisance" behaviour) which appears superficially to be of a sociable nature. The results imply that the majority of alleged offenders who are shouting, singing, jostling members of the public on footpaths etc. are on their own at the time of police intervention.

Interpretation must be highly tentative, but it is suggested that one or more of the following hypothetical circumstances may contribute:—

- (a) that after he has passed a certain point in his drunken behaviour a person may tend to become an embarrassment to his fellow-drinkers, and so get left on his own.
- (b) that finding himself alone after a social occasion may lead a drunk to behave in ways in which he would not behave in the presence of his companions.
- (c) that a group of drunks, on seeing a police officer may be more likely to stop behaving in a disorderly manner than a solitary drunk would be; and that a police officer may find it easier to reason with a group (one or more of whom may be relatively sober) than with a solitary drunk, and so is more likely to avoid the need to make a charge, when dealing with groups than with solitary drunks.
- (d) that the approach of a police officer may often cause part of a group to scatter, leaving the most drunken member (or the member with most dutch courage) alone.
- (e) that drunkenness offenders, as distinct from the drunken population as a whole, may tend to be solitary drinkers.

The greater likelihood of the London offender being on his own, regardless of his behaviour, than the offender in the rest of England and Wales, may well derive from his generally greater propensity, regardless of behaviour, to be at least partially incapable.

(viii) *Physical injury and loss of personal property*

87. In the MPD 96%, and in the rest of England and Wales 89%, of alleged offenders caused no injury or loss of personal property to anyone. Most loss or injury was confined to the offender's own group, but 1% in the MPD and 2% in the rest of England and Wales inflicted injury or loss on members of the public unknown to them. 3% outside London inflicted injury or loss on police officers (less than 0.5% in the MPD). (*Table 47*)

88. Loss or injury, unless confined to the offender and/or his companions, was very rarely associated with a charge of either simple or aggravated drunkenness. But 38% of the *minorities charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence* had, in both areas, caused injury or personal loss to someone. The 38% included 18% in both areas who had injured (or taken or destroyed the property of) police officers, 8-9% who had caused loss or injury to members of the public who were strangers, 1-2% to officials, and 1% to spouse or relative. Other victims were almost exclusively members of the offenders own group. It is noteworthy that attacks on personal enemies by drunks were extremely uncommon.

89. In the majority (62% in both areas) of cases where a charge of damage to property was made, no-one suffered any personal loss (or injury). (*Table 48*)

90. Similarly, in the majority of the very small number of cases where a charge of theft was made, no *personal* loss was reported*. It may be inferred that damage and theft charges were usually concerned with "public" or corporate, not private, property.

*The number of such cases was too small in the MPD to give reliable results. The result quoted refers to the 198 cases in the rest of England and Wales.

91. In more than half (55% and 57% in the two areas, respectively) of the cases in which a charge concerned with obstructing the police was made, a police officer had suffered injury or loss. In about two-fifths no-one suffered injury or loss.

92. Injury or loss was entailed in 90% of assault charges*—members of the public being victims in 50% of cases, police officers in 15%, other officials in 10%. The remainder were principally the offenders' own associates, spouses or relatives. In only 6% of assault charges against drunks was the victim a personal enemy of the offender.

93. In 71% of the very small number of cases in which a drunk was charged with possessing an offensive weapon, no personal injury or loss was involved.

94. These results indicate that personal loss or injury inflicted on persons other than members of the offender's own group very rarely occur amongst those charged with aggravated drunkenness only; and that the substantial majority of those relatively few offenders charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence have not inflicted personal injury or loss on anyone, even among their own associates.

(ix) Carrying and using weapons

95. The proportions of all those charged who carried an offensive weapon was 0.40% in the MPD, and 1.32% in the rest of England and Wales. These include 0.04% who used a weapon in the MPD and 0.43% in the rest of England and Wales. (Table 49)

(x) Medical treatment known to the police

96. Figures relating to the previous treatment of alleged offenders for alcoholism or other nervous disorder are necessarily incomplete. It was agreed at the planning stages of the inquiry that no attempt should be made to make it incumbent on the police to question offenders about medical matters.

97. All that can be said with certainty is that at the very least about one in every thirty-five charges of drunkenness in the whole of England and Wales were made against persons who had previously received medical treatment for alcoholism and/or some other nervous disorder. The true figure may be much greater. (The results obtained for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales were virtually identical).

(xi) Previous convictions

98. In view of the police time that would have been needed to trace each drunkenness offender's record from central sources, information on previous convictions was deliberately confined to the previous records known to the local police. Outside the MPD this would normally be the local Force, but in the MPD it would be the sub-divisions concerned. *The results indicate the proportions of offenders who were known locally for previous offences, and certainly cannot be taken as nearly complete.* On the other hand, if an offender was known locally to have a previous record of drunkenness offences, the exact

*Percentage based on 337 cases outside the MPD. The number was too small for reliable comparison in the MPD.

number of previous convictions was nearly always known. It appears, therefore, that if a person's record is known at all to the local police, it is known precisely.

99. Outside the MPD half the alleged offenders were known to have a previous record—23% for drunkenness offences and for one or more other types of offence, 13% for drunkenness offences only, and 14% for offences other than drunkenness only. In the MPD only 17% were known to the police in the sub-division concerned to have any previous convictions at all.

Whatever the true total proportions of persons with previous convictions may be, they are likely to be greatly in excess of the proportions known locally, and this is particularly true of the MPD where very many of the alleged drunks are found in the inner areas, and, whatever their previous record, are probably not people known at all to the police of the sub-division in which they are found. (Table 50)

100. Of those known to the local police to have previous convictions for offences of drunkenness about one in five in the MPD and more than a quarter in the rest of England and Wales had only one known conviction. 30% of those known to have previous drunkenness convictions in the MPD, and 46% in the rest of England and Wales had more than five known previous convictions, and this includes nearly 5% in the MPD and about 11% in the rest of England and Wales with over 25 previous convictions for drunkenness offences. (Table 51)

101. Outside London half of those known to have one previous conviction for an offence of drunkenness were also known to have been convicted of one or more other offences. The proportion known to have been convicted of other offences rose steadily with the number of known previous convictions for drunkenness—from 57% of those with two known previous convictions for drunkenness offences, 66% of those with 3–5 known previous drunkenness convictions, through 73% of those with 6–10, to 81% of those with 11–25 known previous drunkenness convictions. Three-quarters of those with 26 or more known previous drunkenness convictions were also known to have been convicted of other offences. (Table 52)

102. In the MPD, the pattern was different. There was a very steep rise from a much lower starting point (14%, 25% and 69% of those known to have had 1, 2 and 3–5 previous drunkenness convictions, respectively, were also known to have had previous convictions for other offences). Of those with higher numbers of known drunkenness offences up to 25, half or rather more were known to have previous convictions for other offences, as were two-thirds of those known to have had 26 or more previous drunkenness convictions.

103. The results given in paragraph 99 above are only of relevance in respect of the extent of the nuisance to the local police caused by locally known previous offenders. The relationships described in paragraphs 100–102 probably have a wider validity, and could be extended to drunkenness offenders as a whole *if we were to assume that if any part of an alleged offender's previous record is known to the local police, then the whole of his record is likely to be known.*

(xii) Celebrations

104. Special occasions and events were reported to be the reason for drinking in 7% of cases in the MPD, and in 10% in the rest of England and Wales. The difference between the two areas appears to be mainly due to the fact that two

Christmas and New Year seasons were included in the period of the inquiry outside the MPD, but only one in the period covered in the MPD. (Table 53)

105. Ignoring, for the moment, national festivities; weddings, birthdays and similar domestic events were the most common reason for celebrating to the point of being charged with a drunkenness offence (2.5% and 2.9% in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales, respectively); celebrations of sporting events followed (1.5% or 0.8%); and no other single type of special occasion or event was stated to be the reason for celebration by as many as 0.5% in either area.

106. In order to find the effect of national festivities, the six-month periods from November to April were considered separately. There were two such periods outside the MPD, and one in the MPD. The period includes all the national saints days, except St. George's day, as well as Christmas and New Year. In this six-month period the proportions of offenders stated to be celebrating national festivities ranged from about 4% in the Inner MPD to about 9% in the English county Forces.

(xiii) Type of drink consumed

107. No information was obtained by the police from the alleged offender about the type(s) of drink he had consumed in 24% of cases in the MPD, and 15% in the rest of England and Wales. In view of the deficiencies and unevenness in the data, only very general statements can be made, and minimal proportions (likely to be substantially lower than the true proportions) quoted.

108. Males. Beer alone had been drunk by the majority of male offenders, but at least 26-27% in the MPD and at least 22% in the rest of England and Wales had consumed other or mixed drinks—most commonly beer mixed with spirits, or spirits alone. (Table 54)

109. Females. At least 47% of female offenders in the Inner MPD and at least 53% in the Outer MPD had become drunk on some other drink or drinks than beer alone. In the Inner MPD the most usual drink of the female offender was beer alone, followed by wine (in which category "wine" ciders and perries are included), followed by spirits only. In the Outer MPD the most usual drink of female offender was spirits alone, followed by beer alone, then wine.

Outside the MPD at least 43% of female offenders had become drunk on some other drink or drinks than beer alone. Beer, however, was the most common drink, followed by wine, then spirits.

110. Type of drink and age. The greatest proportions of offenders under the age of 25 were found amongst beer and spirit mixers, beer-only, and spirits-only drinkers. Conversely the smallest proportions of offenders aged 50 and over were found among consumers of these drinks. The greatest proportions of persons aged 50 and over were found among drinkers of cider, methylated spirit, or wine. (Tables 55, 56, 57)

111. Employment status and type of drink. Manual workers currently employed make up a clear majority of known beer-drinking offenders and of known mixers of beer and spirits. They make up between about one third and one-fifth of the known drinkers of each other type of drink, including other mixed drinks, (but excluding methylated spirits) in the MPD; and between about one-third and two-fifths in the rest of England and Wales.

The *unemployed* constitute the great majority of those offenders known to have drunk methylated spirits, and 44% to 45% of known cider drinkers. They also contribute heavily in relation to their total numbers to the known wine-drinkers, and to the known drinkers of mixed drinks, other than beer with spirits. (Table 61)

112. *Behaviour.* The degree of incapacity and the behaviour of persons who had consumed different types of drink is discussed in the text. There was no evidence that consuming mixed drinks led to an exceptional degree of incapacity. Apart from the small group of methylated spirit drinkers, there was little consistency between the behaviour-patterns of those who had consumed different types of drink in the MPD, and in the rest of England and Wales, respectively. It is concluded that on the strength of the incomplete data available:—

- (a) in the MPD very similar proportions of offenders are very drunk irrespective of what they have been drinking.
- (b) the tendency in the MPD for there to be more "public nuisance" behaviour reported of drunks with aggravating behaviour than is the case in the rest of England and Wales, appears to bear no clear relationship to the type of drink consumed.
- (c) in this inquiry no attempt was made to ascertain the quantity of drink consumed. But it seems likely that the *quantity*, rather than the *type(s)* of drink is the decisive influence on behaviour. Such differences in behaviour as do occur in relation to type of drink are probably related rather to the characteristics of persons favouring different types than to the peculiar effects of particular drinks (other than methylated spirits). For example the more aggressive types of behaviour tend to be associated with beer and spirit mixers and/or beer-only drinkers. But these are predominantly the younger male offenders' drinks, and one would expect the younger generation to be more active than their elders. (Tables 58, 59, 60)

IV CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT

(f) Time of day

113. The time of day at which the police first intervened in each incident was recorded, correct to the nearest quarter-hour. In the description which follows the expressions "shortly before" and "shortly after" a stated time refer to the $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes either side of the two stated times. The total period referred to is thus always one quarter-hour longer than the interval between the stated times. (Tables 62 and 63)

114. 57% of offenders in the MPD and 62% in the rest of England and Wales were charged as a result of incidents in which the police first intervened during the 2 hours between shortly before 10 p.m. and shortly after 11.45 p.m.

115. The single peak hour was the period from shortly before 11 p.m. till shortly after 11.45 p.m. Nearly one third (32.5% and 32.6% in the two areas) of all offenders were charged as the result of incidents taking place in this one hour. The only difference between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales, in this

respect, was that outside the MPD incidents fell mainly into the earlier half-hour of the period, and inside the MPD into the later half-hour. This reflects the earlier closing times for public houses prevalent outside the MPD.

116. The second peak in the MPD (16%) is the hour between shortly after midnight and shortly after 12.45 a.m. In the rest of England and Wales the second peak is the hour from shortly before 10 p.m. and shortly after 10.45 p.m. Though the time of the second peak outside London probably reflects earlier closing hours, the time in the MPD may well be, at least in part, a reflection of the longer periods spent in streets and on public transport *after* closing-time by drunks from the Inner area returning home. This suggestion is supported by the fact that incidents tend to fall off in frequency at an earlier time in the Inner MPD than they do in the Outer.

117. There is a small, but very consistent, tendency for a greater proportion of offenders to be charged in the MPD than elsewhere as a result of incidents taking place both in the small hours of the morning (each hour from shortly before 1 a.m. to shortly after 4.45 a.m.) and in each later period from shortly before 5 a.m. till shortly after 2.45 p.m.

118. Afternoon incidents, soon after closing time, account for no more than 4.5% to 4.7% of all charges in any one hour, in either the MPD or the rest of England and Wales.

119. Outside the MPD the proportion of offenders charged as a result of incidents between shortly before 3 p.m. and shortly after 7.45 p.m. ("afternoon and early evening incidents") varied systematically with degree of incapability—21% of the totally or nearly totally incapable were charged as a result of incidents between these hours, 16% of the partially incapable, 12% of the merely incoherent, and 10% of those who were neither incapable nor incoherent.

This is the pattern we might expect if the afternoon and early evening offenders tended to be the more irresponsible. But no such consistent tendency was found in the MPD.

(ii) Day of week

120. 45% of charges in the MPD resulted from incidents occurring on Friday and Saturday (Saturday 26%), compared with 53% (Saturday 30%) in the rest of England and Wales.* The remaining charges were rather more evenly distributed between incidents on each of the remaining days of the week in the MPD than elsewhere, but the general tendency was the same, with Mondays, Thursdays, and Sundays each accounting for 10% to 12%; Tuesdays and Wednesdays for rather fewer. (Table 64)

121. Behaviour on Fridays and Saturdays. Not only were incidents heavily concentrated into Friday and Saturday, but the behaviour of drunks on Fridays and Saturdays tended to be at its most violent. 45% of all charges in the MPD resulted from incidents taking place on Fridays and Saturdays, but 50% or more of the offenders showing the following types of behaviour were charged

*These percentages refer, of course, to charges arising from incidents taking place up until shortly after midnight on Saturday. The proportion of charges arising from Saturday-night drinking are likely to be appreciably higher.

as the result of incidents taking place then: physical violence; threatening or aggressive behaviour; obstructing the police; damage to property. The preponderance of aggression, violence, threats and damage found among Friday and Saturday offenders in the MPD was also found in the rest of England and Wales. (Table 65)

122. *Charges on Fridays and Saturdays.* 51 % of all charges of drunkenness with another offence in the MPD and 57 % in the rest of England and Wales resulted from incidents which took place on Fridays or Saturdays. A particularly high proportion of charges of obstructing the police (55 % and 58 % of all such charges in the two areas respectively) arose from incidents which occurred on Fridays and Saturdays. (Table 66)

123. *Incapacity on Saturdays.* Persons charged as a result of incidents taking place on Saturdays include rather lower proportions of those rated as comparatively capable than of those rated as partially or totally incapable. The difference was fairly slight, but was found in both areas. It is peculiar to Saturday, and does not apply to Friday offenders. (Table 67)

(iii) Place of Incident

124. In classifying the place where an incident started, the police were instructed to include the following as starting on the appropriate enclosed premises. Incidents immediately outside the premises:

- i Ejections from, or attempts to gain entry, or re-entry, to private or public premises.
- ii Incidents originating in a dwelling even though the offender(s) apprehended etc. outside.
- iii Incidents in the forecourt, garden etc. or immediately outside enclosed premises IF:
(a) the incident originated in the premises, forecourt or garden,
or (b) the persons charged etc. came directly from such premises to participate in, or precipitate the incident.

125. The great majority of all persons charged—85 % in the MPD and 73 % in the rest of England and Wales, were charged as the result of incidents taking place in the street. 4-5 % in each area were charged as a result of incidents on public transport; 3 % in the MPD and 7 % in the rest of England and Wales as the result of incidents in public houses, and similar proportions as a result of incidents in other buildings, doorways etc. It is very rare in the MPD for charges to arise from the incidents originating in the offender's home but 2 % of incidents outside the MPD originated there. (Table 55)

126. *Charges and place of incident.* The more serious charges were particularly likely to be associated with incidents which did not originate in the street:—

- i *Public transport.* In the MPD 7 % of all charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence, and 9 % of charges of obstructing the police were the outcome of incidents on public transport. This tendency was confined to the MPD.
- ii *Public houses.* 17 % of all charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence in the MPD, and 19 % of such charges in the rest of England

and Wales arose from incidents started in public houses. In both areas a high proportion of charges of damage to property (22% and 25%) were the outcome of such incidents.

- iii *Dance halls and clubs.* Incidents originating in dance halls and clubs contributed negligibly to any type of charge made in the MPD. Outside the MPD they contributed 5% to all charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence, and 8% to charges of obstructing the police.
- iv *Offender's own home.* Incidents originating in the offender's own home accounted for 2% of all charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence in the MPD, and 3% in the rest of England and Wales.

127. The remaining charges that arose from incidents which did not take place in the street originated in a variety of public, and private places. Miscellaneous public places were the place of origin of 2-3% of charges, but were not associated with any particular type of charge. Miscellaneous private places include doorways, gardens, dwelling places other than those at which an alleged offender was living etc. These places tended to be associated with the more serious offences (9-10% of charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence in both areas originated from incidents in such places).

128. *Assault charges.* Of the small number of assault charges outside the MPD*, only 39% originated from incidents in the street. They were often associated with incidents originating in public houses (23%), clubs (7%), public transport (7%) or the offender's own home (7%).

129. *Charges of petty theft or fraud.* Such charges were very uncommon*. Only a minority (44%) originated from incidents in the street. Greater proportions of these charges than of any others originated from incidents on public transport (10%) and in miscellaneous public (9%) or private (18%) places. 16% originated in public houses. These results are consistent with the general tendency for behaviour which could lead to such charges to consist very largely of refusal or failure to pay bills or fares.

(iv) The Officers who intervene

130. *Rank.* 95% of alleged offenders in the MPD and 94% in the rest of England and Wales were charged as the outcome of an incident in which an officer of the rank of Police Constable was the first to intervene. (Table 70)

131. *Age.* In the Inner MPD, 65% of those charged were charged as the outcome of an incident in which the first officer to intervene was aged under 25 (in 38% of cases he was aged between 19 and 21). The corresponding figures for the outer MPD, and for the rest of England and Wales, respectively were: 44% and 42% the outcome of incidents in which the first officer to intervene was aged under 25, including 36% and 21% who were aged between 19 and 21 years. (Table 71)

132. *Length of service.* 51% in the Inner MPD, 40% in the Outer MPD and 35% in the rest of England and Wales were charged as the result of an incident in which the first officer to intervene had 2½ years or less service in any police force. (Table 72)

*The number in the MPD is too small for reliable results.

133. These results cannot be evaluated without detailed knowledge of the distribution by age and length of service of those officers who are exposed to drunkenness offences, and how they are deployed. From the point of view of the offender they imply that, especially in Inner London, older offenders are likely to be faced with police officers many years their junior; and that the young offenders are often likely to be faced with officers as young as, or younger than, themselves. But this may be true for minor offenders in general, and not peculiar to the drunkenness offender.

(v) Officers' duties at time of incident; how an officer came to be present; and offenders' behaviour related to the source of information about the incident.

134. Duties. 78% of alleged offenders in the MPD were first approached by an officer on foot patrol (or pedal cycle patrol)—83% in the Inner MPD and 60½% in the Outer MPD. The corresponding figure for the rest of England and Wales was 70% (Table 73)

135. 15% in the MPD (11% Inner area; 29% Outer area) were first approached by an officer on a motorised patrol; 23% in the rest of England and Wales.

136. Officers on a wide variety of different duties (and a few off-duty) make up the rest of those who were first to approach the offender—those on outdoor supervisory duties (2·1% and 2·4%) being the most frequently represented.

137. How present. In the MPD 81% of the officers who intervened came across the incident in the course of their normal duties, 6% were called by a publican, manager etc. at the scene of the incident, and 13% were called by members of the public. This 13% consisted of 10% who were not personally affected; and 3% who complained of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to personal property etc. on the part of the alleged offender. (Table 74)

In the rest of England and Wales 66% of intervening officers came across the incident in the course of their normal duties; 12% were called by publicans, management, etc. and 22% were called by a member of the public. Again only a minority of members of the public who called the police (6% out of 22%) were personally affected by the incident.

138. The use of uniformed motorised patrols. Officers on uniformed motorised patrols were the first to approach 11% of those offenders in the MPD who were found by the police in the course of their normal duties (Inner area 9%; Outer area 22%). Officers from such patrols first approached 15% of offenders found by the police in the course of their normal duties in the rest of England and Wales. (Table 75)

139. Officers on motorised patrols in the MPD were the first to approach 29%, 30% and 44% of offenders in incidents to which the police were called, respectively, by managements, and by members of the public who were not, and were themselves affected. The corresponding proportions in the rest of England and Wales were 37%, 38% and 39%.

140. Motorised patrols were much more frequently the first to intervene in the Outer MPD than in either the Inner MPD or the rest of England and Wales.

In the Outer area an officer from a motorised patrol was the first to intervene in 44% of incidents reported by management; 42% of incidents reported by

members of the public who were not personally affected; and 54% of incidents reported by members of the public who *were* personally affected.

141. The part played by motorised patrols in investigating the complaints of outside callers about drunks is clearly a major one, both in absolute terms and by comparison with their contribution to picking up drunks in the course of normal duty.

142. Motorised patrols contribute most to apprehending drunks by whom members of the public complain that they have been personally affected. Without knowledge of the number of such complaints *received* by the police in relation to the number successfully followed up, it is difficult to evaluate this fact. But it seems clear that an increase in the use of mobile patrols would lead to a greater proportion of such incidents being cleared up.

143. An increase in the proportion of offenders charged as the result of an incident in which the first officer to intervene was a member of a motorised patrol was found in all types of police force during the eighteen months of this inquiry.* The difference was marginal in the English county forces, but ranged from an additional 2% to an additional 5% of offenders picked up by mobile patrols in other forces. (Table 76)

144. The Outer MPD not only showed the highest proportion picked up by mobile patrol in the first six months of the inquiry (27%), but also showed the largest increase (+5%) in the final six months.

145. Behaviour of drunks associated with outside calls to the police. The types of behaviour most frequently associated with charges arising from calls by management or public were:

1. Petty theft and minor fraud
2. Damage to property
3. Physical violence
4. Threatening or aggressive behaviour
5. Sexual behaviour.

A proportion of the order of 50% or more of all charges, in both areas, arising from incidents in which drunks behaved in any of the ways described were brought to the attention of the police as the result of outside calls. (Table 77)

146. Charges resulting from outside calls to the police.

- i *Simple drunkenness.* 4% of these charges in the MPD and 6% in the rest of England and Wales were the outcome of calls by management etc. 13% and 26% originated in calls from the public. In very few of these cases did members of the public consider themselves personally affected: it is inferred that they called the police in the interests of the drunk.
- ii *Drunkenness with aggravations.* 7% of such charges in the MPD and 13% in the rest of England and Wales originated in calls by managements etc. 12% in the MPD and 18% in the rest of England and Wales originated in calls to the police from members of the public. Members of the public calling the police were rather more likely to be unaffected than affected personally by such incidents.

*I.e. comparing the first six months of the inquiry with the last six months—which, of course, implies a comparison between the same six months of the year in each case.

- iii *Drunkenness at the same time as another offence.* 47% of persons charged with a drunkenness and other offence(s) in the MPD, and 50% in the rest of England and Wales were found as the result of an outside call to the police. Calls from managements etc. were the origin of about a quarter of such cases in both areas, and calls from the public were the source of the remainder. Members of the public making such calls were rather more often personally affected than not—but the difference was small and a total of only 12%—13% of all such charges arose from calls by members of the public who were personally affected by the drunks' behaviour.
- iv *Specific non-drunkenness charges.* Charges of *damage to property* were particularly likely to arise from incidents reported to the police by managements etc. (28% and 30%). Of the small number of *assault* charges outside the MPD* only 26% arose from incidents met with by the police in the course of their normal duties. 28% arose from calls by managements; 26% from members of the public who were themselves affected; and 20% from members of the public not personally affected.

Many alleged offenders found as a result of outside calls prove refractory. In the MPD 24% of all charges of *obstructing the police*, and 40% in the rest of England and Wales were the outcome of outside calls—about equally divided between calls from managements and from members of the public. (Table 78)

147. Certain of the results reported above might seem to suggest a lesser willingness on the part of the public in the MPD to call the police than was found in the rest of the country. But the differences derive largely from the Inner MPD, and they could well reflect no more than different methods of policing the inner part of the Metropolis.

*The number of cases was too small in the MPD for comparison to be practicable.

I BACKGROUND AND METHOD

(i) Origin and Purpose

Between the years 1955 and 1962 the annual number of offences of drunkenness proved in the courts of England and Wales increased by 54.9%. The increase was by no means a steady one; indeed, the year 1958 showed a decline (-2.90%) on 1957, and the year 1959 showed only a marginal increase (+0.20%) on 1958*.

In the three subsequent years (1960-1962) however, each successive year showed an increase over the preceding one, and the annual increase became progressively greater.

TABLE 1
Increase in the number of offences of drunkenness proved: 1959-1962*

Year	Number of offences proved	Variation compared with previous year, in number of offences proved	
		Number	%
1959	65187	—	—
1960	68109	+2922	+4.48
1961	74694	+6585	+9.67
1962	83992	+9292	+12.45

It was against this background that the present inquiry was planned, at the request of the Home Office.

Its main object was to obtain information on the characteristics of those charged with offences of drunkenness, their behaviour and condition, and the circumstances which led to their apprehension, in order to obtain a better understanding of the nature of the social problem presented by drunkenness offenders.

If the annual increases which characterised the years 1960 to 1962 were to continue, it was hoped that the results might yield some useful information about the nature of such changes—to what extent they were associated with changes in police methods and/or with changes in the behaviour and other characteristics of the offenders themselves. In practice, however, the number of drunkenness offenders proved in the courts declined each year between 1963 and 1966.

(ii) Method

A sample of 50% of the Police Forces in England and Wales outside the Metropolitan Police District, and of 25% of the sub-divisions in the MPD was drawn. Forces outside the MPD were divided into three strata: City Forces; Borough Forces, and County Forces. Within each stratum selection was at random. In the MPD, the sub-divisions were divided into two strata: those sub-divisions lying either in whole or in part within a five-mile radius of Charing Cross

*Source: Annual Home Office statistics published each year by H.M.S.O. under the title "Offences of Drunkenness".

(henceforth referred to as the "Inner MPD"); and the remaining sub-divisions (henceforth referred to as the "Outer MPD"). Within each stratum selection was at random. A list of the forces, and sub-divisions of the MPD, which were included in the sample is given in Appendix III.

A standard form was designed in collaboration with the Home Office, and in consultation with Police representatives, on which police officers could record details of each incident of drunkenness leading to a charge. This was piloted for one week in all police forces—i.e. a form was completed in relation to each relevant incident falling within that week—and, as a result, the form was slightly modified.

The final version of the form is reproduced in Appendix I. Appendix II shows the instructions on how it was to be completed, and by whom.

Outside the MPD, forms were completed by officers of the selected Forces during the eighteen months from November 1964 till April 1966*, inclusive. Owing to police boundary changes coincident with the formation of the Greater London Council, it would have been impossible to obtain information relating to identical areas during this period. Consequently the starting date in the MPD was postponed until May 1965, and forms were completed in the selected sub-divisions from May 1965 till October 1966, inclusive.

Forms were returned to the Government Social Survey in monthly batches from each force, and were scrutinised as immediately as possible after they were received for omissions and inconsistencies. Where these occurred, the relevant forms were returned *once* to the Force concerned, with a note appended stating where omissions or apparent inconsistencies occurred. Occasionally forms with omissions were sent back by the police unamended and without explanation. These were not returned a second time, because by this time the incident to which they referred would be one of several weeks ago, and reconstruction might be impossible or, if attempted, unreliable.

All the information required on the first three pages of the four-page form could be obtained without questioning the alleged offender, since it was concerned with the circumstances of the offence, the offender's behaviour, the charge(s) made against him, and similar data. This part of the form was completed by the senior officer present at the incident, (in consultation with any junior colleague(s) who were present before he arrived).

With the exception of three items (the offender's sex, his previous record, and whether or not he carried or used an offensive weapon) the last page of the form required information which could only be obtained by questioning the offender (unless he was already known to the police).

An intoxicated person is unlikely to be in a fit state to answer questions reliably, and the police were therefore asked to obtain this part of the information at an appropriate time, wherever possible. Because of the organisational problems involved, it was expected that some or all of this information would perforce not be obtained in some cases, and provision was made on the form for a tick to be entered in the appropriate place to indicate where no information

*The actual starting date was October 1964. But early returns very often included incomplete forms, and some misunderstandings became apparent. This is not surprising, since formal briefing of all officers in each force (any one of whom might have to complete a form) was impracticable. Returns for October were used to attempt to reduce omissions to a minimum and to clear up misunderstandings.

had been obtained for each one of these items*. In these cases, the form was returned to the Force concerned only when the answer to the question was left blank and the "no information" box was not ticked, which might have been due to an oversight. But, clearly, if information on any of these items had not been obtained before or immediately after the alleged offender's appearance in court it could not be recovered later.

In respect of the alleged offender's previous record (number of previous convictions for offences of drunkenness, and whether or not previously convicted of any other offence), it was agreed at the planning stage that it would be impracticable, because it would take up too much police time, to refer to central records. This information is therefore based on *local police knowledge* of the alleged offender's previous record, and no distinction can be made between those without previous convictions, and those who might have convictions which were not known to the local police.

(iii) Reason for considering the Metropolitan Police District separately from the Rest of England and Wales.

Owing to the different dating of the inquiries in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales (made necessary by the boundary changes accompanying the formation of the Greater London Council), it would not have been practicable to provide results for this inquiry which were representative of the whole country for a specified eighteen months.

Consideration was given to the desirability of providing such combined results for the 12-months during which the inquiries in the two areas overlapped in time. However interim analyses of key parts of the data, made at six-monthly intervals while the inquiry was in progress, showed that very large differences indeed existed between certain of the characteristics of alleged offenders in the MPD, and those in the rest of England and Wales.

As the Table below shows, in the period covered by this inquiry and the years immediately preceding it something of the order of two-fifths of all drunkenness offences proved were the outcome of incidents within the Metropolitan Police District:—

TABLE 2
Drunkenness offences proved in England and Wales 1962-1966
Offences in the MPD as a proportion of all offences.

Year	Number of offences of drunkenness proved		MPD as % of all England and Wales
	MPD	All England and Wales	
1962	35226	83992	41.9
1963	35783	83007	43.1
1964	32889	76842	42.8
1965	30395	72980	41.6
1966	28170	70499	39.9

*With the exception of a question concerning previous treatment for alcoholism or other nervous disorder. It was agreed at the suggestion of police representatives at the planning stage that it would be improper to imply that police officers should directly question an alleged offender on medical matters. Consequently no distinction was made on the form between those who were not questioned and those who had had no treatment.

In the light of the above facts it appeared more meaningful to contrast the two areas—MPD and the rest of England and Wales—than to examine the overall results for the whole country, which would conceal the different patterns found in the largest Police District in the country and the remaining Districts.

(iv) Trends in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales, and possible effects of this inquiry on the number of charges made.

Trends in the annual number of offences of drunkenness proved did not follow the same pattern in the MPD as they did in the rest of England and Wales. It is of particular interest to note that in the three years 1960 to 1962, the *cumulative* greater increase each year can be attributed almost entirely to the MPD. Table 3 shows the trends between 1960 and 1962 (a period of increase) and between 1963 and 1966 (a period of decline).

TABLE 3
Number of offences of drunkenness proved in each year from 1959 to 1966 in the Metropolitan Police District, and in the rest of England and Wales

Year and area	Number of offences proved	Numerical increase or decrease over preceding year	Percentage increase or decrease
1959 MPD	27045	—	—
Rest of E/W	38142	—	—
Total E/W	65187	—	—
1960 MPD	26673	- 372	- 1.38
Rest of E/W	41436	+ 3294	+ 8.63
Total E/W	68109	+ 2922	+ 4.48
1961 MPD	29197	+ 2724	+ 10.21
Rest of E/W	45297	+ 3861	+ 9.31
Total E/W	74694	+ 6585	+ 9.67
1962 MPD	35226	+ 5829	+ 19.82
Rest of E/W	48766	+ 3469	+ 7.65
Total E/W	83992	+ 9298	+ 12.44
1962 MPD as % of 1959			+ 30.24
Rest of E/W			+ 27.85
Total E/W			+ 28.84
1963 MPD	35783	+ 557	+ 1.58
Rest of E/W	47224	- 1542	- 3.17
Total E/W	83007	- 985	- 1.17
1964 MPD	32889	- 2894	- 8.09
Rest of E/W	43953	- 3271	- 6.93
Total E/W	76842	- 6165	- 7.43
1965 MPD	30395	- 2494	- 7.49
Rest of E/W	42585	- 1368	- 3.12
Total E/W	72980	- 3862	- 5.03
1966 MPD	28170	- 2225	- 7.33
Rest of E/W	42329	- 256	- 0.61
Total E/W	70499	- 2481	- 3.40
1966 MPD as % of 1959			+ 4.15
Rest of E/W			+ 10.97
Total E/W			+ 8.14

It will be seen that in the year 1960 there was a small decline over 1959 in the MPD in the number of offences proved, while in the rest of England and Wales there from an increase of 8.63%. The national increase was +4.48%. In 1961 and 1962 there were increases of 10% and nearly 20% in the MPD over the respective preceding years, while the rest of England and Wales showed a fairly steady rate of increase in each year from 1960 to 1962. There followed a slight national decline in 1963; not yet, however, manifest in the MPD. In each of the three subsequent years the national figures showed a decline. This was of the order of 7 to 8% per annum in the MPD; but in the rest of the country the annual decline diminished each year, from -6.93% to -3.12% to -0.61% in 1964, 1965 and 1966, respectively.

In 1966 the increase over 1959 was 8.14% in the country as a whole (+4.15% in the MPD, and +10.97% in the rest of England and Wales), whereas in 1962 it stood at +28.84% above the 1959 level for the country as a whole. (MPD: +30.24%; Rest of England and Wales: +27.85%).

* * * * *

This crude comparison between the MPD and the other police districts of England and Wales must not be taken to imply any uniformity in the trend in different districts outside the MPD. It illustrates two important points:

- i that if the MPD is excluded, the *cumulatively greater* annual increase in the years 1960, 1961 and 1962 is no longer evident.
- ii that the major swing in the MPD from an increase of nearly 20% over the previous year in 1962, through near-stability in 1963, to a decline of 6.93% in 1964, predates this inquiry (which was in progress in the MPD from May 1966 till October 1966).

In the MPD the annual decline in the number of offences proved was of the same order of magnitude each year from 1964 to 1966, inclusive.

In an inquiry of this nature the possibility cannot be ignored that the extra task of filling in a form for each drunk charged might marginally reduce the numbers charged (e.g. by causing the police unconsciously to increase a little their efforts to deal with incidents in such a way as to make it unnecessary to bring a charge).

In order to examine this possibility we need, ideally, to be able to compare trends over a period of years in the police districts included in the sample, and the remaining districts.

For the MPD this is not practicable, partly because of the changes in boundaries which shortly preceded the period of the inquiry, and partly because the sample was one of sub-divisions, and a reconstruction for each sub-division of the number of offences proved over a period of years would present a very arduous task for the police.

Table 4 shows for the remaining city, borough, and county forces separately, the changes which took place between 1961 and 1965 in the number of offences proved, for those police authorities included in the sample, and for all Police Authorities, in each type of force (excluding the MPD).

TABLE 4

Changes in number of charges of drunkenness proved over the years 1961 to 1968

Police Authorities in England and Wales*	Percentage change in number of charges proved				
	1961-2	1962-3	1963-4	1964-5	1965-6
Sample cities*	% +7.2	% -4.4	% -17.2	% -25.1	% -38.0
All cities*	+9.6	-3.8	-13.3	-10.8	-22.6
Sample boroughs	+9.3	-8.7	+3.0	+4.3	+7.4
All boroughs	+8.2	-6.0	+1.8	+8.3	+10.2
Sample counties	+5.0	+2.1	+3.6	+3.6	+7.3
All counties	+3.7	-0.4	-0.1	+2.8	+2.7

*Excluding Metropolitan Police District

If the inquiry directly affected the number of convictions, the way in which this occurred is evidently a complex one. The sample cities followed the directions of all cities throughout the period, but tended to show larger decreases and smaller increases when these occurred in all the cities. In the only full year (1965) during the whole of which Incident Reports were being completed, the sample cities showed a larger decrease in offences than might have been expected. The sample county boroughs tended to swing more than the national trend before the research period, and during the fieldwork showed a smaller increase than would be expected.

By contrast, the counties sampled had increases in each year, whereas the national county trends showed two years in which the increases were arrested.

These results suggest, though they do not prove, that the inquiry may have held increases in check in the borough forces sampled, and steepened the decline in city forces. Certainly it did not reverse the trend which preceded it in any of the three types of force, or in the MPD.

(v) The Samples

(a) Distribution by type of Force and between the Inner and Outer MPD.

The following Table shows the distribution between city, borough and county forces of alleged offenders charged with offences of drunkenness (with or without another charge) in the sample; and compares this distribution with the distribution of persons found guilty of such offences in the year 1965 (two-thirds of the period of the inquiry). The Metropolitan Police District is excluded from this Table. The sample bases quoted are less than the total sample, since those charged with alternative offences under by-laws etc. are omitted.

Since the national figures are available only for complete calendar years, whereas the sample covers eighteen months; and since the sample includes persons against whom the charge may be withdrawn or dismissed (though the number of such cases is likely to be less than 1%) exact correspondence between the distributions would not be expected. The following results may be considered satisfactory.

TABLE 5
Distribution of drunkenness offenders by type of force
(Excluding MPD)
1965 convictions compared with sample charged

Type of Force	Persons found guilty of offences of drunkenness in 1965* in all forces of this type (excluding MPD)		Persons charged with offences of drunkenness in the sample (Nov. 1964-April 1966)		Difference of percentages (National sample)
	No.	%	No.	%	
City forces	19829	46.8	15491	46.1	-0.7
Borough forces	8862	20.9	7836	23.3	+2.4
County forces	13677	32.3	10266	30.6	-1.7

For the MPD the actual distribution of convictions between the "Inner" and "Outer" sub-divisions during the 18-month period of the inquiry was available*. The next Table compares this actual distribution with the distribution of charges in the sample:

TABLE 6
Distribution of drunkenness offenders by area in the MPD
Actual convictions in period of inquiry compared with number of persons charged in the sample

Area	Actual convictions in period of inquiry		Persons charged with offences of drunkenness in the sample		Difference of percentages
	No.	%	No.	%	
"Inner" MPD (sub-divisions falling in part or in whole within 5 miles of Charing Cross)	38047	81.3	10442	77.8	-3.5
"Outer" MPD (remaining sub-divisions)	8736	18.7	2734	22.2	+3.5

The sample slightly under-represents the "Inner" area, which actually accounted for rather over 81% of convictions in the period of the inquiry, but accounts for slightly less than 78% in the sample.

(b) Distribution by age, within each type of force

The distribution by age of the sample of persons charged within each type of force are compared in the next Table with the distributions for these types of force of offences proved in 1965. For the MPD the actual distributions are given for both 1965 and 1966, since the inquiry was in progress for eight months in 1965 and 10 months in 1966. Cases in the sample in which no information on age was given are omitted from the bases. These amounted to 1% outside the MPD (City forces 1.2%; borough forces 1.2%; county forces 0.8%), and 5.3% in the MPD.

*Figures were supplied by New Scotland Yard, analysed by Licensing District. It so happens that sub-divisions within each Licensing District are either all in the "Inner" or all in the "Outer" areas.

(The age-groupings shown here are those used in the annual publication "Offences of Drunkenness". Different and finer groupings have been used in the report).

TABLE 7
Distribution of drunkenness offenders by Age and Type of Force
1965 convictions (1965 and 1966 for MPD) compared with sample charged

H.

Type of Force	Age					Bases (excluding "no information" in sample bases)
	Under 18	18-20	21-29	30-59	60 and over	
<i>MPD</i>						
Convictions 1965	% 0.6	4.5	19.0	67.7	8.2	30395
Convictions 1966	% 0.7	5.3	19.2	66.6	8.2	28170
Sample May 1965 to October 1966	% 0.6	5.4	22.2	64.7	7.1	12486
<i>Rest of England and Wales</i>						
1. <i>City Forces:</i>						
Convictions 1965	% 3.2	13.7	25.3	52.5	5.3	19829
Sample Nov. 1964 to April 1966	% 3.3	14.5	24.9	50.5	5.6	15309
2. <i>Borough Forces</i>						
Convictions 1965	% 4.1	15.4	25.3	49.7	5.5	8862
Sample	% 3.9	14.7	25.0	49.8	5.7	7760
3. <i>County Forces</i>						
Convictions 1965	% 5.2	19.4	27.3	43.9	4.3	13077
Sample	% 5.6	18.8	28.2	42.4	4.2	10060
<i>All England and Wales (excluding MPD)</i>						
Convictions 1965	% 0.6	4.5	19.0	67.7	8.2	41768
Sample	% 0.7	5.3	19.2	66.6	8.2	33129

Comparing the sample results with the convictions for 1965/6 in the MPD it seems probable that those aged 21 to 29 are slightly over-represented and those aged 30 to 59 correspondingly slightly under-represented in the sample. The differences are small and cannot appreciably affect the results.

In the rest of England and Wales as a whole the distribution by age derived from convictions in 1965 differs negligibly from that found in the sample. The sample distributions in each of the three main types of force also follow closely the distributions of convictions in all such forces in 1965.

(c) Distribution by Sex, within each type of force

The next Table gives similar information to the previous one in respect of the distribution by sex of the sample and of those convicted of drunkenness offences in 1965 (1965/66 in the case of the MPD).

The 1966 distribution of convictions in the MPD is almost identical with the sample distribution.

Outside the MPD the overall proportion of persons convicted who were women was 4.0%, compared with 4.9% in the sample, and a slightly larger proportion of women is consistently found in the sample in each kind of force than among those convicted in 1965. Although there was a very slight increase in

TABLE 8

Distribution of Drunkenness Offenders by Sex and Type of Force
1965 convictions (1965 and 1966 for MPD) compared with sample charged
H.

Type of Force	Sex		Bases (excluding "no information" in sample bases)
	Male	Female	
<i>MPD</i>			
Convictions 1965	% 92.8	7.2	30395
Convictions 1966	% 92.0	8.0	28170
Sample	% 92.1	7.9	13188
<i>Rest of England and Wales</i>			
1. City Forces:			
Convictions 1965	% 95.6	4.4	19829
Sample	% 94.5	5.5	15483
2. Borough Forces:			
Convictions 1965	% 95.3	4.7	8862
Sample	% 93.8	6.2	7832
3. County Forces:			
Convictions 1965	% 97.3	2.7	13677
Sample	% 96.9	3.1	10251
<i>All England and Wales (excluding MPD)</i>			
Convictions 1965	% 96.0	4.0	42368
Sample	% 95.1	4.9	33566

1966 in the proportion of persons convicted who were women (from 4.0% to 4.2% outside the MPD), this does not explain the consistent discrepancy. It is possible that women are more likely than men to be discharged or to have their case dismissed. The differences are not in themselves sufficient to have any appreciable effect on the results.

In general it may be concluded that, insofar as approximate comparisons can be made between a sample of persons charged during a period of 18 months and the numbers of persons convicted over periods of a calendar year, the sample appears to be closely representative of the whole in respect of type of police district; distribution between "Inner" and "Outer" London; and of age and sex within force-type.

* * * * *

Note: Certain of the Tables shown in this report are based on calculations made at six-monthly intervals during the inquiry, using E.A.M. machines. The remainder are based on computer tabulations.

For England and Wales outside the MPD there is a discrepancy of 45 cases in the total bases (E.A.M. base 34,642; computer base 34,597). It has proved impossible definitely to trace the reason for this discrepancy, but it is believed to be mainly attributable to deletions through the removal of duplicated cards at the final editing stage before the data were transferred to the computer. The deletions are believed to be randomly distributed, and cannot materially affect the results. Computer-based tables are marked "C" and E.A.M.-based ones "H" at top left of the table.

II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR

(i) The principal charges

In the Table overleaf we show the distribution of the main types of charge made against those in the samples who were charged in the MPD, and in the rest of England and Wales, respectively.

In this Table, the first three categories correspond with those incorporated (without differentiation between them) in the annual Home Office statistics for Offences of Drunkenness. The fourth category ("Non-drunkenness charge only") should consist of persons whose conduct was clearly affected by drink AND:

- either (a) A charge commonly or occasionally used as an *alternative* to one of drunkenness was made (e.g. Breach of the Peace; Charges under Bye-laws, such as Disorderly Behaviour, Committing a Nuisance etc.)
or (b) The person concerned was likely to have been charged only with an offence of drunkenness, or one of the alternative charges described in (a) above *and not with anything more serious*, had he been sufficiently intoxicated to merit such a charge.

The decision as to whether an intoxicated person should be included in category 4 was, of course, that of the police. The intention was to incorporate under (b) above those whose actual charge would have *given way* to a charge of simple or aggravated drunkenness *only* (or its equivalent), had they been more drunk. The internal evidence sometimes suggests, however, that this part of the instruction was misunderstood; and that, in fact, category 4 consists of intoxicated persons facing alternative or bye-law charges, together with some who, had they been more drunk, would have been charged with drunkenness *and another offence*, and some who would have been charged with an offence of drunkenness *only*.

This matter will be discussed in detail in Section viii of this Chapter.

68% of those charged in the MPD were charged with simple drunkenness only, compared with only 36% in the rest of England and Wales. Certain types of aggravating behaviour, such as urinating or vomiting, are not inconsistent with a charge of simple drunkenness (c.f. Table 18), and the proportions charged *solely* on account of their drunken state (i.e. those having no act reported against them apart from direct manifestations of their inability to look after themselves) were consequently lower than the above figures for simple drunkenness charges—namely 63.1% in the MPD and 33.5% in the rest of England and Wales.

The extreme contrast between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales applies to city, town and county forces alike. The proportions charged with simple drunkenness only, in the three types of force ranged between 33% and 38%.

The Metropolitan Police District has had a high rate of drunkenness convictions per head of the population (45.64 and 42.36 per 10,000 population

TABLE 9
The Main Types of Charge
Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Charge	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England & Wales
1. Simple drunkenness only	% 67.2	% 65.9	% 67.8	% 35.9
2. Drunkenness with aggravations only	29.0	20.7	27.1	48.4
3. Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	1.6	3.4	2.0	12.2
4. Intoxicated person charged with non-drunkenness offence only	2.1	9.5	3.8	3.4
No information	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0
Bases (No. of persons)	10670	3041	13711	34597

in 1965 and 1966 respectively), and it might be supposed that a high prevalence of all manifestations of drunkenness which merit a charge is likely to be associated with a high proportion of those charged being in an incapable state and therefore charged with simple drunkenness only.

However, this does not appear necessarily to be the case. Separate analysis for a northern city with a drunkenness rate consistently higher than that in the MPD showed that only 28% of those charged there were charged with simple drunkenness only*.

(ii) Degree of Incapacity

Officers rated each person charged on a four-point scale according to his or her degree of incapacity at the time of the incident, which was defined on the form as follows:—

1. **TOTAL OR NEAR TOTAL INCAPABILITY.** Flat out; unconscious or asleep; unable to remain upright without support.
2. **LESSER DEGREE OF INCAPACITY.** Tottering; staggering; supported by friends; supporting self against wall etc. at intervals; danger to self or others through lurching into roadway etc.
3. **INCOHERENT** (only if neither 1 nor 2 apply). Heavily slurred speech; incoherent but inoffensive remarks addressed to strangers or to no-one in particular.
4. **NONE OF THE ABOVE APPLY.**

Table 10 shows the police assessments of the degree of incapacity of those charged in the MPD and in the rest of England and Wales.

*It was agreed with Chief Constables in planning this inquiry that the report would give only a global picture, and that individual Forces would not be named or separately considered. For this reason the city mentioned above cannot be identified.

TABLE 10
Degree of Incapacity
Inner and Outer MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

H.

Degree of Incapacity	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England & Wales
	%	%	%	%
1. Totally or nearly totally incapable	50 } 93	38 } 85	47 } 91	30 } 66
2. Partially incapable	43 }	47 }	44 }	36 }
3. Incoherent only	4 }	7 }	5 }	8 }
4. None of the above	3 }	8 }	4 }	26 }
Bases	10670	3041	13711	34642

Half of those charged in the Inner MPD, nearly two-fifths in the Outer MPD, but less than one in three in the rest of England and Wales, were said to be in a state of total or near-total incapacity. Nine out of ten in the MPD as a whole, but only two-thirds in the rest of England and Wales were at least partially incapable.

Only 4% in the MPD, but 26% in the rest of England and Wales were stated to be neither incoherent nor incapable.

This latter difference between the areas is partly, but only partly, accounted for by the smaller proportion charged with aggravated drunkenness or drunkenness at the same time as another offence in the MPD when compared with the rest of England and Wales. Table 11 shows the distribution by degree of incapacity of those in each of the three main charge-groups included in the annual "Offences of Drunkenness" statistics. (It will be noticed that some of those charged with aggravated drunkenness or drunkenness at the same time as another offence were also stated to be totally or nearly totally incapable at the time of the incident. Since the definition of this state includes "being unable to stand upright without support" the charges and the degree of incapability are not incompatible. A person who cannot stand upright without support may be quite capable of using insulting language etc., or of damaging property).

98 to 99% of those charged with *simple drunkenness* in both the MPD and the rest of England and Wales were at least partially incapable. The majority (66% in the MPD; 77% in the rest of England and Wales) were in the extreme state of being "flat out" or unable to remain upright. It will be noted that this proportion is *lower* in the MPD than outside it. (See Table 11 overleaf).

In the case of those charged with *aggravated drunkenness* the contrast between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales was a marked one. 80% of those charged in this way in the MPD were at least partially incapable, compared with only 49% in the rest of England and Wales. The difference between the proportions who were merely incoherent was slight, but only 9% of those charged with aggravated drunkenness in the MPD were stated to be neither incapable nor incoherent, compared with 38% in the rest of England and Wales.

Of those charged with *drunkenness at the same time as another offence* 64% in the MPD, and 43% in the rest of England and Wales were said to be at least partially incapable. Similar proportions in both areas (13% and 11%) were

merely incoherent. But outside the MPD the proportion (46%) who were said to be neither incapable nor incoherent was twice as great as it was within the MPD (23%).

TABLE 11
Degree of Incapacity by Charge
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Degree of Incapacity	Charge					
	Simple Drunkenness		Aggravated Drunkenness		Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	
	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
Totally or nearly totally incapable	66% 32	77% 22	10% 70	2% 47	7% 57	3% 40
Partially incapable	2	1	11	13	13	11
Incoherent	2	1	9	38	23	46
None of the above						
Bases (100 %)	9167†	12430	3744	16891	282	4272

*Less than 0.5%.

†Omits 14 cases in which no information was recorded on the degree of incapacity of those charged with simple drunkenness.

Thus, although those charged with simple drunkenness in the MPD were rather *less* likely to be "flat out" than were their counterparts in the rest of England and Wales, charges of aggravated drunkenness or of drunkenness at the same time as another offence were much *more* likely to be associated with some degree of physical incapability in the MPD than they were elsewhere. The difference, in both cases, lies in the proportions who were neither incapable nor incoherent.

A number of possible inferences might be drawn from the results. They could reflect differences in police policy; differences in the behaviour of intoxicated persons; differences in public tolerance (and consequently police tolerance) of certain manifestations of drunkenness; and/or the presence at certain times of large concentrations of drunks (which might make it necessary, in order to maintain reasonable order, for the police to concentrate their attention on those who showed the most obvious signs of incapability).

These possible inferences are neither supported nor negated by the internal evidence, but the variety of the possible implications needs to be stated here in order to avoid any tentative interpretation of the major differences between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales in the proportions charged with aggravated drunkenness or with drunkenness at the same time as another offence, who were neither incoherent nor incapable.

The behaviour of those who are intoxicated, but neither incapable nor incoherent, is often paralleled by the behaviour of those who are not influenced by alcohol at all. If such behaviour renders a person liable to a charge, and there is reason to suppose that he has been drinking, one of three courses are open to the police:—

1. It may be decided that, although he has been drinking, his actions are not at all the outcome of intoxication. He will then, of course, not be charged with a drunkenness offence.
2. It may be decided that his actions are, to a lesser or greater degree, the outcome of intoxication. These actions may not be of a particularly serious nature, and he may be charged only with aggravated drunkenness. Such a charge may be considered more leniently by the court than would a parallel charge indicating that he had behaved in the same manner while in full possession of his senses.
3. It may be decided that, although he was to a lesser or greater degree intoxicated at the time, his actions were of too serious a kind to warrant incorporation in a single charge of aggravated drunkenness. In such cases he may be charged only with the major offence, or with that offence in addition to one of drunkenness. Drunkenness may be regarded by the bench as a mitigating circumstance.

Although, in many instances a person who is neither incapable nor incoherent may nonetheless be quite clearly drunk, there will inevitably be borderline cases in which the police must decide on rather tenuous grounds, whether to proceed with an aggravated drunkenness charge only, a non-drunkenness charge, or a multiple charge which includes a charge of drunkenness.

If we assume that a given act committed while sober is likely to be regarded more seriously by many courts than is the same act committed while drunk, it would be in the interests of justice to charge a person with a drunkenness offence in preference to another offence when this can be justified; and to add a drunkenness charge to another charge when this can be justified, (providing the other charge is not so grave as to make the alleged drunkenness of the offender of little or no relevance). In borderline cases the police would, in effect, be giving the benefit of the doubt to alleged offenders who were possibly motivated to some extent by the effects of alcohol.

At first sight it appears that the Metropolitan Police are much less inclined than are those in the rest of the country to give alleged offenders the "benefit of the doubt" in this way. However, it must be borne in mind that only 4% of offenders in the MPD, compared with 26% of those in the rest of England and Wales, were rated as neither incoherent nor incapable. It may well be that the Metropolitan police are so hard pressed in dealing with those alleged offenders of whose drunken condition there can be no doubt that many of those who show relatively mild signs of intoxication are, perforce, overlooked. If this were the case, the few who were neither incapable nor incoherent might well be people who clearly manifested their intoxication in some other way. The question of giving the "benefit of the doubt" would then comparatively rarely arise. Persons who in less hard pressed forces might be charged, and given the benefit of the doubt by being charged with a drunkenness offence may, to a large extent, be overlooked in the MPD, in the interests of clearing the streets of the more ostentatiously drunk.

(iii) The nature of aggravating behaviour (detail)

In Table 12 the actions of those who were reported to have shown any form of aggravating behaviour are considered in detail. As we have shown, the proportion with aggravating behaviour was much greater in the rest of England and Wales than it was in the MPD, and differed between the outer and inner sub-

divisions of the MPD. The present Table gives no indication of the *absolute* frequencies with which given types of behaviour were reported from different areas, but provides a *comparison* between the nature of the behaviour of those showing aggravating behaviour in these areas. A Table showing the absolute frequencies of each type of behaviour (i.e. one based on the complete samples, including those who showed no aggravating behaviour) is given in Appendix V (Table 12(A)).

Behaviour is grouped in twelve main categories, in nine of which two or more different types of behaviour are here separately considered. In subsequent Tables only the twelve main categories will be used. In calculating these tables unit weight has been given to all behaviour in a given category reported of the same individual.

The effect of "telescoping" the different categories in this way reduces the apparent variety of different acts. But the effect is fairly small. The average number of different acts per person with aggravating behaviour was, on the full list, 1.34 in the MPD and 1.80 in the rest of England and Wales. By reducing the number of categories to twelve, these averages are reduced to 1.26 and 1.62. Thus 7% to 10% of all acts are "lost" by eliminating the multiple counting of two or more similar acts reported of the same offender.

In the Table which follows the effect of giving unit weight to all behaviour falling in the same main category is indicated by the two aggregate figures shown for each of the categories. The first is the sum of the percentages for all acts in the category; the second (bracketed) figure is the percentage obtained when multiple counting within category is eliminated.

For convenience of presentation the descriptions of certain types of behaviour have been abbreviated from those given on the form completed by the police. The items on the form do not appear in the same order as they do when grouped together in the Table. Full descriptions, arranged in the same order as the Table are given in Appendix IVa, to which the reader is referred.

Particular attention is drawn to the following:

Group 3. General "Public Nuisance" Behaviour

Item i. "Rowdiness or horseplay" is further defined by examples as:—"shouting; singing; climbing lamp-posts; horseplay amongst OWN group, not involving others except through noise, or obstruction *incidental* to horseplay". This item is intended to cover all behaviour which carries no threat at all to persons or property.

Group 4. Insulting language or behaviour

Item ii. "Insulting behaviour" is further defined by examples as "addressing insulting, derogatory or mocking remarks to strangers (*Not* threatening or aggressive, *not* obscene)". This item is intended to cover all forms of verbal insult and mockery which are neither obscenely expressed nor capable of carrying any implication of threat.

Group 6. Obstructing the police

Item iii. "Attack on Police Officer". This item excludes assaults on the police implied in items i or ii (Attempts to resist arrest or to 'rescue' others).

Group 7. Petty Theft and Minor Fraud

Item ii. "Other behaviour involving stealing". This item was originally split into five groups:— Theft of souvenirs; Shoplifting; Pocket-picking; other

theft from public place; other behaviour involving stealing. Since all these items combined concern the behaviour of less than 1% of those with aggravating behaviour, no differentiation has been made between them in the Table.

TABLE 12††
Acts reported of offenders showing any aggravating behaviour: detail analysis
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	Outer MPD	Inner MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England & Wales
	%	%	%	%
1. <i>Physical Violence</i>				
i Fighting amongst own group	8.8	5.3	6.1	10.9
ii Fighting, attacks on strangers	4.3	2.5	2.9	5.9
iii Resisting attempt by management to eject or refuse entry	6.1	4.7	5.1	8.6
iv Other behaviour involving violence to people	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.5
	20.3 (18.7)	12.6 (12.2)	14.4 (13.8)	25.9 (24.0)
2. <i>Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence</i>				
i Threatening behaviour—own group	5.7	3.1	3.7	6.8
ii Threatening behaviour towards strangers	9.0	5.6	6.5	11.3
	14.7 (14.5)	8.7 (8.6)	10.2 (10.0)	18.1 (17.9)
3. <i>General "public nuisance" behaviour</i>				
i Rowdiness or horseplay	27.0	38.6	35.7	25.3
ii Deliberate obstruction of footway	1.3	1.9	1.8	3.2
iii Deliberate obstruction of traffic	3.2	2.5	2.7	2.8
iv Pushing, jostling, bumping the public	8.8	7.2	7.6	8.3
	40.3 (37.9)	50.2 (48.0)	47.8 (45.5)	39.6 (34.8)
4. <i>Insulting language or behaviour</i>				
i Unsolicited remarks to strangers	4.3	3.6	3.8	2.6
ii Insulting behaviour	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.2
iii Obscene language amongst own group	5.4	2.8	3.4	9.3
iv Obscene language directed at strangers	6.9	8.1	7.8	14.2
v Obscene or offensive language directed at police	8.0	5.6	6.2	26.3
	29.3 (22.7)	24.8 (20.3)	25.9 (20.9)	57.6 (46.8)

††Note: In this Table *all* aggravating behaviour is considered. This includes the behaviour of those persons charged only with simple drunkenness who had some aggravating behaviour reported against them; those charged with an offence of drunkenness with aggravations; with drunkenness at the same time as another offence; and those drunks charged only with an offence other than a drunkenness offence.

TABLE 12—continued

Behaviour	Outer MPD	Inner MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England & Wales
	%	%	%	%
5. <i>Sexual behaviour</i>				
i Accosting person of same sex	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.5
ii Accosting person of opposite sex	1.3	0.9	1.0	0.9
iii Other sexual behaviour	2.2 (2.2)	1.3 (1.3)	1.5 (1.5)	1.5 (1.4)
6. <i>Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)</i>				
i Attempt to resist arrest	7.1	3.3	4.2	5.1
ii Attempt to rescue someone else from arrest	1.5	0.4	0.6	1.7
iii Attack on police officer	1.5	1.1	1.2	4.0
7. <i>Petty theft and minor fraud</i>				
i Refusing or neglecting to pay bill or fare	1.7	0.6	0.9	1.1
ii Other behaviour involving stealing†	1.1	0.5	0.6	0.9
8. <i>Damage to property</i>				
i Accidental damage to property	1.6	0.7	1.0	1.0
ii Deliberate damage to property	5.2	2.6	3.2	8.7
iii Other behaviour involving damage to property	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3
9. <i>Neglecting children</i>				
i Leaving child unattended/drunk in charge of a child	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
10. <i>Behaviour involving Drugs</i>				
i Behaviour involving drugs	—	—	—	*
11. <i>Vomiting and Urinating</i>				
i Vomiting	6.9	3.0	4.0	3.5
ii Urinating, defecating	20.0 (19.2)	18.8 (18.8)	19.1 (18.9)	11.0 (10.5)
12. <i>Other behaviour</i>				
i Any other behaviour not listed	4.4	1.8	2.5	3.3
Number of Acts	1920	4955	6875	42198
Number of persons showing aggravating behaviour (bases for percentages)	1268	3880	5148	23429
Average number of different acts per person showing aggravating behaviour	1.51	1.28	1.34	1.80

†The figures given for "other behaviour involving stealing" are the sums of several separately classified, but each very rare, different acts. See note on item ii, immediately preceding this Table.

*Less than 0.1%.

The Table shows very similar trends in the MPD and outside it so far as the nature of the main component acts in the majority of behaviour-groups are concerned.

The outstanding difference between the MPD and the Rest of England and Wales is this: "Public nuisance" behaviour is by far the most commonly reported type of aggravating behaviour in the MPD, while Insulting language and behaviour is by far the most common type in the rest of England and Wales. We shall comment on and describe the nature of this difference later. It is, however, clear from the above Table that it is almost entirely accounted for by the much greater incidence of rowdiness and horseplay amongst offenders in London (mainly in Inner London) than in the rest of England and Wales, and the very much smaller incidence in London of insulting language and behaviour directed at the police.

"Rowdiness and horseplay" was a much more common form of aggravating behaviour in the Inner MPD (38.6%) than it was either in the Outer MPD (27.0%) or the rest of England and Wales (25.3%). Apart from this each act was less frequently reported of offenders showing aggravating behaviour in the Inner MPD than it was of such offenders in the rest of England and Wales, with the following exceptions:

Unsolicited remarks to strangers. Inner MPD 3.6%; rest of England and Wales 2.6%.

Accosting persons of the opposite sex. 0.9% in both Inner MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

Urinating. Inner MPD 15.8%; rest of England and Wales 7.5%.

Corresponding exceptions in the Outer MPD were:

Miscellaneous behaviour involving violence to people. Outer MPD 1.1%; rest of England and Wales 0.5%.

Deliberate obstruction of traffic. Outer MPD 3.2%; rest of England and Wales 2.8%.

Pushing, jostling, bumping into people. Outer MPD 8.8%; rest of England and Wales 8.3%.

Unsolicited remarks to strangers. Outer MPD 4.3%; rest of England and Wales 2.6%.

Accosting person of same sex. Outer MPD 0.9%; rest of England and Wales 0.5%.

Accosting person of opposite sex. Outer MPD 1.3%; rest of England and Wales 0.9%.

Attempt to resist own arrest. Outer MPD 7.1%; rest of England and Wales 5.1%.

Refusing or neglecting to pay fare or bill. Outer MPD 1.7%; rest of England and Wales 1.1%.

Miscellaneous behaviour involving stealing. Outer MPD 1.1%; rest of England and Wales 0.9%.

Accidental damage to property. Outer MPD 1.6%; rest of England and Wales 1.0%.

Vomiting. Outer MPD 6.9%; rest of England and Wales 3.5%.

Urinating. Outer MPD 13.1%; rest of England and Wales 3.3%.

With the exception of "rowdiness and horseplay", and urinating and vomiting, most of these differences concern uncommon types of behaviour and most are very minor ones.

(iv) Behaviour (main types) and capability

67% of arrested drunks in the MPD were charged with simple drunkenness only, and 60% had no aggravating behaviour of any sort reported against them. The corresponding proportions in the rest of England and Wales were 36% and 24%.

In the following Table all those with aggravating behaviour reported against them are again considered, and the MPD is compared with the rest of England and Wales in a simplified form, using the broad behaviour-groups instead of individual acts. It should be noted that this Table includes *all* persons with aggravating behaviour reported against them (including those charged with another offence as well as drunkenness, and drunks charged only with a non-drunkenness offence).

TABLE 13

Behaviour of all those with aggravating behaviour reported against them*
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
1. Physical violence	14	24
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	10	18
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	46	35
4. Insulting language or behaviour	21	47
5. Sexual behaviour	2	1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	6	10
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	1	2
8. Damage to property	4	10
11. Urinating, vomiting etc.	19	11
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	3	4
Bases† (persons with aggravating behaviour)	5148	23429
Average number of different types of behaviour per person with aggravating behaviour	1.26	1.62

*Percentages add to over 100% because many people had more than one type of aggravating behaviour reported against them.

†The bases include all offenders with aggravating behaviour in contradistinction to later tables concerned with the aggravating behaviour of those facing specific types of charge.

The arrested Metropolitan drunk with aggravating behaviour has, on average, fewer different acts reported against him than has his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales.

He is, however, *more* likely to cause a public nuisance or to urinate or vomit in a public place.

In general he is reported as less prone than his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales to the more serious forms of aggravating behaviour—physical violence; threatening behaviour; insulting language; obstructing the police; damaging property.

The most marked difference lies in the proportion of arrested drunks who were reported to have used insulting language or behaviour—21% in the MPD, and 47% in the rest of England and Wales. An analysis of the component parts of the category is given in the following Table—

TABLE 14
Insulting language and behaviour
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Nature of insulting language and behaviour	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
	%	%
Unsolicited, annoying, but inoffensive remarks to strangers	15	4
Insulting, derogatory etc. remarks to strangers	18	9
Obscene language amongst own group	13	16
Obscene language to strangers	30	25
Obscene, indecent or offensive language to police	24	46
Base (total number of items of insulting language and behaviour reported)	2664	13498

Those alleged offenders in the MPD who use insulting language are very much less likely than are their counterparts in the rest of England and Wales to address their insults etc. at the police. They are considerably more likely to address insulting, or merely annoying remarks to strangers, and about equally likely to use obscene language, whether amongst themselves or directed towards strangers.

The only general category of behaviour, apart from vomiting or urinating, to which the drunk with aggravating behaviour is more prone in the MPD than elsewhere is behaviour causing a general nuisance to the public. An analysis of this category into its component parts shows—

TABLE 15
"Public Nuisance" behaviour
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
	%	%
Rowdiness and horseplay	75	64
Deliberate obstruction of footway	4	8
Deliberate obstruction of roadway	6	7
Pushing, jostling, bumping into members of public	16	21
Base (total number of items of "public nuisance" behaviour)	3904	9288

In the MPD those drunks who make themselves a nuisance to the public more often indulge in rowdiness, and horseplay amongst themselves*, which is an incidental nuisance, and less often do things clearly calculated to annoy, than is the case amongst their counterparts in the rest of England and Wales.

In general terms these results are consistent with those already reported (c.f. Table 11). 80% of all persons charged with aggravated drunkenness in the MPD were at least partially incapable, compared with only 49% in the rest of England and Wales. It is not surprising, therefore, that aggravating behaviour among arrested drunks in the MPD should be less inclined than it is in the rest of England and Wales to violence; to calculated threats and insulting language; and, indeed, to any form of behaviour or speech which requires coordinated thought or action.

Nor it is surprising that the number of different acts per person reported of aggravated drunks in the MPD should be less than it is elsewhere. The arrested London drunk with aggravating behaviour is usually at best incoherent, and unlikely to be capable of any great complexity of behaviour.

In brief the arrested London drunk who is not so incapable as to be passive tends to be more of a general nuisance, but less of a threat, to others than does his counterpart outside the MPD. He is more ostentatiously drunk, and so more closely resembles the simple drunk who is incapable of any action.

A concrete indication of the relative degrees of incapacity exhibited by persons showing different types of aggravating behaviour is obtained by relating each type of behaviour to the distributions of the "degree of incapacity" ratings given to those behaving in this way by the police.

In order to simplify presentation a "capability score" was obtained by giving the following weights to each point on the rating scale:

	Weight
Total or near-total incapability	1
Partial incapability	2
Incoherent but not incapable	3
Neither incapable nor incoherent	4

The average "capability score" of persons showing each form of behaviour was calculated on this basis†. The lower the score, the less capable, on average, the person exhibiting this form of behaviour. Table 16 shows these scores, in rank order for the MPD, starting with the type of behaviour associated with the *lowest* average degree of capability.

The average degree of capability of those showing each one of the nine forms of aggravating behaviour was less in the MPD than it was in the rest of England and Wales. The mean score in the MPD has, therefore, also been expressed in the Table, for each type of behaviour, as a percentage of the mean score in the rest of England and Wales. This gives a comparative indication, in respect of each type of behaviour, of how *much* more incapable offenders in the MPD were judged by the police to be than those in the rest of England and Wales.

*The category "rowdiness or horseplay" is a rather broad one, and can include both solitary drunks singing or shouting on their own, and groups behaving in a similar manner. Data presented later (Section III, viii) shows that many alleged offenders in this category were, in fact, on their own at the time when a police officer first intervened.

†It will be realised that the behaviour described was often not the *only* form of behaviour attributed to an offender. Differences will tend to be blurred by an association between more and less "serious" behaviour shown by the same individual.

TABLE 16

Average degree of capability of offenders exhibiting each type of behaviour
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Rank order, (starts with least capable)		Behaviour	Mean capability score			Bases	
MPD	Rest E/W		MPD	Rest E/W	A as % of B	MPD	Rest E/W
1	1	Urinating, vomiting etc.	(A) 1.88	(B) 2.13	88	971	2470
2	2	General "public nuisance" behaviour	2.13	2.68	79	2343	8144
3	3	Petty theft and minor fraud	2.20	2.76	80	65	431
4	4	Insulting language or be- haviour	2.32	2.85	81	1075	10958
5	7	Obstructing the police (excl. verbal insult etc.)	2.38	3.11	77	293	2392
6	8	Threatening or aggressive behaviour without vio- lence	2.44	3.02	81	517	4197
7=	5	Damage to property	2.49	2.92	85	221	2322
7=	6	Sexual behaviour	2.49	2.95	84	78	334
9	9	Physical violence	2.61	3.12	84	711	5634

The forms of behaviour associated (in both areas) with the lowest average degree of capability are urinating and vomiting, and "public nuisance" behaviour. These (especially "public nuisance" behaviour) are also the two items for which the mean capability score in the MPD most closely approaches that in the rest of England and Wales. In addition, they are the only two forms of aggravating behaviour which were *more* frequently reported of those showing any aggravating behaviour in the MPD than they were of those showing any such behaviour in the rest of England and Wales*.

This result illustrates in a concrete manner our earlier suggestion that the Metropolitan offender with aggravating behaviour, tends to show more simple behaviour than does his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales, partly because he is less capable of complex activity.

At the other extreme we have physical violence. This is the form of behaviour associated with the highest capability score in both areas. It is also an item which is much less common amongst those showing aggravating behaviour in the MPD (14%) than it is among their counterparts in the rest of England and Wales (29%).

Apart from actual physical violence, it is the forms of behaviour which can be perceived as a threat to other persons or to property which tend to be associated with relatively high average capability.

* * * * *

*The position of "petty theft and minor fraud" (associated with a low capability score) is not surprising when it is recalled that the greater part of this behaviour consists of neglect or refusal to pay fare or bills.

Outside the MPD no form of aggravating behaviour apart from urinating or vomiting, and "petty theft and minor fraud" (mainly neglect or refusal to pay fares or bills), was associated with total or near-total incapability in more than 3.1% of cases (range:— 1.1% for physical violence to 3.1% for damage to property). The corresponding range, with the same two exceptions, in the MPD was from 6.6% for physical violence to 10.9%, for obstructing the police.

We should expect *some* relatively vigorous action or robust language by drunks to be associated with total or near-total incapacity at the time of intervention by the police, since a drunk may well "pass out" immediately after such an action or expletive. It appears that such incidents are much more common in the MPD than they are in the rest of England and Wales. This is consistent with the generally more manifest signs of extreme intoxication of offenders in the MPD.

It is, however, surprising to find that, of all forms of aggravating behaviour except the two already mentioned, obstructing the police in the MPD is the more likely to be associated with the highest degree of incapability. This is the end of the time-sequence immediately preceding arrest. The interference would appear to be either that rather more than one in ten drunks who obstruct the police in the MPD "pass out" in the course of an attempt to obstruct them, or that "passive resistance" may be interpreted as obstruction.*

(v) Degree of capability and nature of behaviour

In the data so far presented we have shown that many more London offenders are judged by the police to be totally or partially incapable than is the case in the rest of England and Wales. Consequently a higher proportion are charged only with simple drunkenness.

We have suggested that the detailed information on the nature of aggravating behaviour amongst those who show any such behaviour strongly supports the contention that those charged with aggravated drunkenness in the MPD are less capable of coordinated action than are those facing the same charge in the rest of England and Wales.

We have also suggested that the higher average degree of incapability of London drunks facing any of the three main types of drunkenness charge indicates that the criteria for arrest on a drunkenness charge are more stringent in the MPD than they are in the rest of the country. But this need imply no more than that more stringent criteria must necessarily be applied in a city where the problem is particularly acute—i.e. drunkenness offenders anywhere represent the tip of the iceberg of all drunks who are technically liable to arrest; the greater the proportion of all drunks who are very drunk in a given area, the more likely are the criteria for arrest on a drunkenness charge to be tied to the display of the most "obvious" signs of drunkenness.

Given that less stringent criteria can be applied in the rest of England and Wales than it is practicable to apply in the MPD, can it be shown that offenders in the two areas do in fact represent different parts of the same continuum of drunken behaviour?

*"Total or near total incapability" was interpreted on the form filled in by the police as "flat out", unconscious or asleep; unable to remain upright without support". Being unable to remain upright without support is not wholly inconsistent with attempting to resist arrest.

We make one assumption—that the more capable a person charged with aggravated drunkenness is, the more likely is he to act in a complex way. The complexity of an offender's actions can be roughly judged by the number of *different* sorts of behaviour reported of him.

If different parts of the same continuum of behaviour were being used as criteria for arrest in the MPD and outside it, we should expect there to be a constant ratio between the average degree of capability of all offenders and the average number of different acts attributed to those offenders charged with offences other than simple drunkenness only.

The mean capability score for the whole of the samples was compared with the mean number of different acts attributed to those showing any form of aggravated behaviour (regardless of the charge):—

Area	(A) Mean capability score	(B) Mean number of acts by persons with aggravating behaviour	(B) as % of (A)
MPD	1.66	1.26	76 %
Rest of England and Wales	2.30	1.62	70 %

This result suggests that the Metropolitan Police do not use *different* criteria from the Police in the rest of England and Wales in deciding who to charge with a drunkenness offence, but that they use the more critical end of the same continuum which is used elsewhere.

* * * * *

It must be emphasised that there is nothing in what has been said above to indicate that the London police are more lenient towards drunks, or the people of London more permissive than is the case elsewhere. If it is accepted that the most a police force can do is to remove some of the "worst" offenders from the streets, then our results simply indicate that this "worst" group is a much more ostentatiously drunk one in the MPD than it is elsewhere.

We would add, however, that the "worst" drunks are not necessarily the most offensive, and they tend to be the less menacing to the public. Indeed, the fact that persons charged with aggravated drunkenness in the MPD tend to be more drunk than they are elsewhere, seems to imply that they are *less capable* of being very offensive to the public (or to the police).

(vi) Behaviour associated with charges of aggravated drunkenness only

We have so far considered *all* those persons in the samples against whom aggravating behaviour was reported. These include, as well as those charged with a drunkenness offence only, persons charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence, and a minority (to be described shortly) of intoxicated persons charged only with a non-drunkenness offence.

The next Table (17) shows the behaviour of those charged with aggravated drunkenness only, and also gives in brackets the comparative figures for all persons with aggravating behaviour (taken from Table 13).

TABLE 17

Behaviour of those charged with aggravated drunkenness only
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Type of behaviour	Proportion of persons charged with aggravated drunkenness only who behaved in this way	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
1. Physical violence	13 % (14)	22 % (24)
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	10 (10)	18 (18)
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	50 (46)	38 (35)
4. Insulting language or behaviour	20 (21)	48 (47)
5. Sexual behaviour	1 (2)	1 (1)
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	3 (6)	5 (10)
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	1 (1)	1 (2)
8. Damage to property	1 (4)	2 (10)
11. Vomiting, urinating, etc.	18 (19)	8 (11)
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	1 (3)	2 (4)
Base (those charged with drunkenness with aggravations only)	3699	16832
Average number of different types of behaviour per person charged with aggravated drunkenness	1.18	1.45

Note: The base figures quoted include 1.2% of aggravated drunks in the MPD and 0.3% in the rest of England and Wales against whom no specific aggravating behaviour was recorded.

Not surprisingly, the behaviour of those charged with aggravated drunkenness only tends to be less complex than that of all offenders with aggravating behaviour.

There are two outstanding differences between the two groups:—

1. *Obstructing the police.* Although this behaviour is reported of 3% (MPD) and 5% (Rest of England and Wales) of those charged only with aggravated drunkenness, it is twice as common (6% and 10%) among the whole group of offenders showing aggravating behaviour.
2. *Damage to property.* This is reported of only 1 to 2% of persons charged with aggravated drunkenness only, but of 4% (MPD) and 10% (rest of England and Wales) of all those showing aggravating behaviour.

Every type of behaviour is thus sometimes embodied in the single charge of aggravated drunkenness, but damage to property and obstruction of the police are the most likely to be associated with a separate charge.

(vii) Aggravating behaviour reported of those charged with simple drunkenness only.

7% of those charged with simple drunkenness only in the MPD and 11% of those so charged in the rest of England and Wales had some aggravating behaviour reported against them. Table 18 shows how this behaviour was distributed.

TABLE 18
Aggravating behaviour amongst those charged with simple drunkenness only

Aggravating behaviour	Incidence of each type of behaviour amongst those charged with simple drunkenness only	
	MPD—All simple drunks	Rest of England and Wales—All simple drunks
1. Physical violence	% 0.4	% 0.4
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	0.2	0.3
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	2.1	1.9
4. Insulting language or behaviour	1.4	2.1
5. Sexual behaviour	0.1	0.1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	0.3	0.1
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	0.2	0.1
8. Damage to property	0.2	0.4
11. Urinating, vomiting etc.	2.5	6.1
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	0.8	0.3
Base (all those charged with simple drunkenness only)	9177	12430

The most common form of aggravating behaviour by simple drunks was urinating or vomiting (reported of 2.5% of all simple drunks in the MPD, and of 6.1% in the rest of England and Wales).

With this exception and two others each form of aggravating behaviour was reported against 0.4% or less of simple drunks. The other exceptions were Public nuisance behaviour (2.1% in the MPD; 1.9% in the rest of England and Wales) and Insulting language (1.4% and 2.1%).

In general, then, very few indeed of the persons charged with simple drunkenness have behaviour which could be construed as aggravating overlooked by the police, except for behaviour which in the nature of things cannot be controlled (urinating, vomiting), and some behaviour which can be construed as a nuisance or inconvenience rather than as in any sense a threat to the public.

(viii) Behaviour associated with charges other than charges of drunkenness

As well as those charged with offences of drunkenness (with or without another charge) the police were asked to complete a form for persons charged only with an offence other than one of drunkenness*:

"If the offender's conduct was clearly affected by drink AND:

- (a) A charge commonly or sometimes used as an *alternative* to one of drunkenness was made (i.e. charges under bye-laws, such as "Disorderly behaviour" or "Committing a nuisance")
- or (b) A charge for some other offence was made, because the offender was not sufficiently drunk to merit a charge of drunkenness, or one or more equivalent charges under a bye-law; but who, had he been *more drunk* would have been charged ONLY with simple or aggravated drunkenness or an equivalent bye-law offence".

*The passage that follows is quoted verbatim from the instructions issued to the police.

It was the intention of the second part of this instruction to obtain details of the behaviour of those intoxicated persons the actual charge against whom would have given way to a charge of drunkenness *only* had they been *more* drunk, and this appears to be explicit in the written instruction. The object of both (a) and (b) above was to find those "borderline" cases which avoided inclusion in the statistics for offences of drunkenness.

The distributions of behaviour among those charged, respectively, with drunkenness and another offence; a non-drunkenness offence only; and with aggravated drunkenness only, are shown in the following Table.

TABLE 19

The behaviour of those intoxicated persons charged respectively with drunkenness and another offence; a non-drunkenness offence only; and with aggravated drunkenness only

Behaviour	MPD			Rest of England and Wales		
	Drunkenness and another offence	Non-drunkenness offence only	Aggravated drunkenness only	Drunkenness and another offence	Non-drunkenness offence only	Aggravated drunkenness only
1. Physical violence	% 27	% 26	% 13	% 37	% 26	% 22
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	17	14	10	21	15	18
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	34	38	50	31	21	38
4. Insulting language or behaviour	30	22	20	52	38	48
5. Sexual behaviour	4	2	1	2	2	1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	31	12	3	32	23	5
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	7	1	1	4	5	1
8. Damage to property	39	8	1	42	15	2
11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	7	11	18	5	9	8
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	5	2	1	12	6	2
Bases (number of persons)	283	486	3699	4272	1003	16832
Average number of different types of behaviour per person	2.02	1.38	1.18	2.40	1.58	1.45

The behaviour of those intoxicated persons charged only with an offence other than one of drunkenness bears no consistent resemblance either to that of persons charged with aggravated drunkenness, or to that of persons charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence.

Two lines in the Table—line 6 "Obstructing the Police"; and line 8 "Damage to property"—may indicate its implications. Each of these types of behaviour very rarely occur among those charged with aggravated drunkenness only, are much more common amongst those charged with non-drunkenness offences only, and very much more common amongst those charged with drunkenness at

the same time as another offence. (The same trend, though much less marked, is found in respect of physical violence). From this it seems clear that these types of behaviour are comparatively rarely embodied in a charge of aggravated drunkenness only, but, when a drunkenness charge is made, they usually lead to a second charge as well.

The intermediate position of these types of behaviour among those charged with non-drunkenness offences only—more common than among those charged with aggravated drunkenness, but less common than among those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence—suggests the possibility either

- (a) that the police tended to misunderstand the instruction about intoxicated offenders the charge against whom would have given way to a charge of drunkenness *only* had they been more drunk, and included some against whom a charge of drunkenness would probably have been *added* to the original charge, had the offender been more drunk.
- or (b) that, if the instruction were always understood, the nature of the behaviour in each of the categories mentioned above tended to be less noxious or persistent amongst those not quite sufficiently drunk to merit a drunkenness charge, than it was amongst those who did merit such a charge.

No firm interpretation can be made of these results in more specific terms.

(ix) Behaviour associated with drunkenness charges and with other charges against intoxicated persons.

In Table 20 each act reported has been classified according to whether or not the person who did it was charged with any offence(s) other than simple or aggravated drunkenness.

Since any one person may behave in a number of different ways in the course of an incident, it does not necessarily follow that the act described was the cause of the non-drunkenness charge. The strength of the association between a given act and a non-drunkenness charge indicates the likelihood, if that act forms *part* of a drunk's behaviour, that the whole of his behaviour will lead to a non-drunkenness charge.

TABLE 20
Behaviour associated with (A) drunkenness charges only
(B) other charges

Behaviour	Total number of times reported		Percentage of total associated with:—			
			Drunkenness Charge only		Non-Drunkenness Charge	
	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
No aggravating behaviour	8651	11601	% 100	100	0	0
1. <i>Physical Violence</i>						
Fighting or physical violence confined to own group	315	2565	% 81	88	19	12
Fighting, physical violence, or attack on strangers	150	1389	% 69	74	31	26

TABLE 20—continued

Behaviour	Total number of times reported		Percentage of total associated with:—			
			Drunkenness Charge only		Non-Drunkenness Charge	
	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
1.— <i>continued</i>						
Resisting attempt by management to eject, refuse entry to pub, club, dance hall or any premises other than private dwelling	261	2017	% 75	78	25	22
Other behaviour involving violence to people (other than attacks on police)	(18)	110	% (39)	37	(61)	63
2. <i>Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence)</i>						
Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence) confined to own group	192	1593	% 83	93	17	7
Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence) to stranger(s)	333	2649	% 82	92	18	8
3. <i>General "public nuisance" behaviour</i>						
Rowdiness or horseplay	1840	5939	% 92	96	8	4
Deliberate obstruction of footway	93	744	% 88	94	12	6
Deliberate obstruction of traffic	139	657	% 90	97	10	3
Pushing, jostling, bumping into members of the public	390	1948	% 88	97	12	3
4. <i>Insulting language or behaviour</i>						
Unsolicited remarks to strangers	194	603	% 91	94	9	6
Insulting behaviour	240	1229	% 90	92	10	8
Obscene language — own group	177	2171	% 81	90	19	10
Obscene language — strangers	401	3322	% 89	91	11	9
Obscene, indecent or offensive language directed at police	320	6173	% 82	92	18	8
5. <i>Sexual behaviour</i>						
Accosting person of same sex	26	117	% 73	85	27	15
Accosting person of opposite sex	49	202	% 78	90	22	10
Indecent act—same sex	(1)	(4)	% (100)	(75)	(0)	(25)
Indecent act—opposite sex	(2)	(9)	% (50)	(67)	(50)	(33)
Indecent exposure	(6)	(12)	% (83)	(58)	(17)	(42)
Other behaviour involving sex	(1)	(3)	% (100)	(100)	(0)	(0)

TABLE 20—continued

Behaviour	Total number of times reported		Percentage of total associated with:—			
			Drunkenness Charge only		Non-Drunkenness Charge	
	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
6. <i>Obstructing the police</i>						
Attempt to resist arrest	219	1193	% 58	67	42	33
Attempt to rescue someone else from arrest	33	400	% 39	40	61	60
Other attack on police officer	62	944	% 13	9	87	91
7. <i>Petty theft and minor fraud</i>						
Refusing or neglecting to pay bill, fare, etc.	44	251	% 80	82	20	18
Theft of "souvenirs", ashtrays, glasses, etc.	(7)	50	% (0)	12	(100)	88
Shoplifting (incl. from street barrows, etc.)	(2)	(17)	% (50)	(18)	(50)	(82)
Pocket picking or other theft from person	(2)	(1)	% (50)	(0)	(50)	(100)
Other theft from public place	(7)	62	% (0)	3	(100)	97
Other behaviour involving stealing	(5)	60	% (40)	10	(60)	90
8. <i>Damage to property</i>						
Accidental damage to property	49	224	% 76	67	24	33
Deliberate damage to property	167	2050	% 23	11	77	89
Other behaviour involving damage to property	(9)	70	% (22)	44	(78)	56
9. <i>Neglecting children</i>						
Drunk in charge of a child	(7)	60	% (100)	90	(0)	10
Neglect of children, leaving children unattended	(2)	(4)	% (50)	(100)	(50)	(0)
10. <i>Behaviour involving drugs</i>	(2)	(6)	% (0)	(50)	(100)	(50)
11. <i>Urinating and vomiting</i>						
Urinating, defaecating	779	1759	% 92	91	8	9
Vomiting	204	811	% 96	98	4	2
12. <i>Any other behaviour not listed</i>	127	780	% 78	42	22	58
Total	15526	53799	% 93	86	7	14

Note: Bases and percentages are bracketted when the base is less than 25.

If we abstract from this Table only those types of behaviour which yield at least 25 cases in the MPD sample, and at least 100 cases in the sample for the

test of England and Wales, a rather clear picture emerges of the relatively common actions of alleged offenders which are, and are not, likely to be associated with a second (or alternative) charge:—

Behaviour	Percentage of these acts which were associated with a non-drunkenness charge:—	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
1. <i>Acts which are more likely than not to be associated with a second charge</i>		
Attack on police officers, not forming part of an attempt to resist arrest, or to "rescue" someone else	87%	91%
Deliberate damage to property	77	89
Attempt to "rescue" someone else from arrest	61	60
2. <i>Acts which were associated with a second charge in a minority of cases, but in at least 25% of cases in one or both areas.</i>		
Attempts to resist own arrest	42%	33%
Fighting, physical violence or attacks on strangers	31	26
Resisting attempts by management to eject or refuse entry to premises	25	22
Accidental damage to property	24	33
Accosting person of same sex	15	27
3. <i>Acts which were associated with a second charge in less than 25% of cases, but in at least 15% of cases in one or both areas.</i>		
Obscene language directed to strangers	19%	10%
Obscene, indecent or offensive language directed at the police	18	8
Fighting or physical violence confined to own group	12	19
Accosting person of opposite sex	10	22

Physical violence to persons or property are particularly likely to be associated with a second charge; violence specially if it is directed against the police, and damage to property particularly if it is deliberate. The police bring a second charge in about nine cases out of ten if they are spontaneously attacked by a drunk; in about three out of five cases if a drunk attempts to "rescue" someone from arrest; but only in a minority of cases (about one in three to two in five) if a drunk attempts to resist his own arrest.

Fighting or attacking strangers (other than the police) is associated with a second charge in more than a quarter of cases in both areas, but if the violence is confined to the offenders own group a second charge is made in less than one case in five (only about one in eight in the MPD).

While deliberate damage to property is associated with a second charge in the great majority of cases, accidental damage is associated with a second charge in only about a quarter (MPD) or a third (Rest of England and Wales) of cases.

Resisting attempts by management to refuse entry or to eject drunks is associated with a second charge in about one in four to one in five cases.

Apart from violence to persons or property, the only acts which are both at all commonplace and are associated with a second charge in at least 15% but less than 25% of cases in one area or both areas, are:—

- (a) accosting persons of the same, or opposite, sex. (It is interesting to note that, although the numbers concerned are rather small, it is true of both areas that those accosting persons of the same sex are less liable to a second charge than are those accosting someone of the opposite sex).
- and (h) (18–19% in the MPD and 8–10% elsewhere) obscene language directed at strangers; and obscene, indecent or offensive language directed at the police.

Except for refusing or neglecting to pay bills or fares etc., there are very few cases of theft in the sample, but the consistency in the results for different types of theft suggests that these acts are very likely indeed to lead to a second charge.

* * * * *

It will be seen from the main Table that no form of "public nuisance" behaviour by a drunk, no forms of insulting language and behaviour, no threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence (whether confined to the alleged offenders own group or directed at strangers), is associated with a separate charge in as many as one in five cases in the MPD, or more than one in ten cases in the rest of England and Wales.

In general it may be said that:—

- i Verbal threats, insults, offensive language, and behaviour unlikely to be perceived as threatening are rarely associated with a second charge against a drunk. Nor are urinating or vomiting.
- ii Actual acts of violence are more likely to be associated with a second charge, but not much more so if the violence is confined to the offenders own group.
- iii The police are no more likely to bring a second charge when offensive language is directed against them, than they are when it is directed against other persons who are strangers to the alleged offender.
- iv Deliberated actions or actions having a semblance of premeditation are the most likely to be associated with a second charge. In this group attacks on police officers which are not incidental to attempts to resist arrest or "rescue" others; deliberate damage to property; "rescue" attempts; attempts to resist arrest, and physical violence to strangers are—in this order—the most likely to be associated with a second charge—but, even of these, only the first three are associated with a second charge in a clear majority of cases.

* * * * *

Certain of the acts listed are very rarely attributed to drunkenness offenders—most notably the various forms of theft and indecent behaviour. The inference is unlikely to be that very few such offences are committed by intoxicated persons. It would seem much more probable that most people who act in these ways are not, even though they are intoxicated at the time, liable to be charged with an offence of drunkenness. They are not incapable, nor are they necessarily guilty of disorderly or riotous behaviour—the principal criteria by which it can be decided whether or not a person is liable to a drunkenness charge.

It should perhaps be emphasised again here that a study of the behaviour of the drunkenness offender is in no way analogous to a study of the influence of drinking on crime. Not only are very many drunkenness offenders incapable of any action, criminal or other—but a very great part of their behaviour consists of actions which, had they been sober, would have rendered them liable only to a very minor alternative charge.

(x) Charges other than charges of drunkenness

Considering together the charges associated with drunkenness charges, and the alternative charges already described (i.e. those sometimes used in place of a drunkenness charge, and those which would have given way to a drunkenness charge had the alleged offender been *more* drunk), we find that there are three types of charge only which were made against 0.5% or more in both the MPD and the rest of England and Wales. An additional five types of charge were made against 0.5% or more outside the MPD, but against less than 0.5% in the MPD.

TABLE 21

Non-drunkenness charges made against 0.5% or more of alleged offenders in either the MPD, the rest of England and Wales or both

Charge	Proportions charged in this way	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Disorderly or unruly behaviour (or similar offence against bye-law)	2.7%	2.0%
Malicious or wilful damage	0.9	5.2
Assault on police	0.6	3.2
Indecent or obscene language	0.2	1.2
Refusal to quit licensed premises, resisting attempt to eject, attempting to re-enter, etc.	0.2	1.0
Breach of the Peace	0.2	0.8
Wounding and assault charges (excluding indecent assault, assault on police, spouse or relative, and common assault)*	0.1	0.7
Obstructing police	0.1	0.6
Possessing offensive weapon	0.1	0.5
Bases (all persons charged)	13711	34642

Charges implying only the offence of urinating or vomiting (Committing a Nuisance etc.) were made against 0.4% in each area, but apart from the charges listed in the above Table, no other charge was made against as many as 0.3% in the MPD. The same applies to the Rest of England and Wales, with the exception of "using insulting or threatening words or behaviour" (0.4%).

*There were no charges of indecent assault in the MPD sample, and less than 0.05% in the sample for the rest of England and Wales. Assaults on spouse or relatives was alleged against less than 0.05% in the MPD, and 0.1% in the rest of England and Wales. Other common assaults were alleged against 0.2% and 0.1% in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales respectively.

III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKENNESS OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES

(i) Sex

In the Outer MPD the proportions of persons charged with each of the three main types of offence who were women were as follows:

Simple drunkenness	7%
Drunkenness with aggravations	4%
Drunkenness at the same time as as another offence	2%

These proportions are almost identical with those for the rest of England and Wales (7%, 4% and 3%).

Disorderly behaviour is the only single non-drunkenness charge which occurs in sufficient numbers in the outer MPD for comparison to be meaningful. Here again the results from the Outer MPD (6% women) are almost identical with those from the rest of England and Wales (5% women).

In the Inner MPD the pattern is different—

TABLE 22
Charges by Sex*
Inner MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Charge	Percentage of those charged who were women			
	Inner MPD	Rest of England and Wales (excluding Outer MPD)	Bases	
			Inner MPD	Rest E & W
1. Simple drunkenness	8	7	7171	12430
2. Drunkenness with aggravations	9	4	3097	16891
3. Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	11	3	176	4272
7. Damage to property	10	3	79	1855
12. Obstructing the police	8	3	73	1360
6. Disorderliness	8	5	182	1195
All persons charged (including charges not listed in Table)	8	5	10778	38003

Women constituted a similar proportion of persons charged with simple drunkenness in the Inner MPD in the rest of England and Wales (8% and 7%).

Their contribution to charges of aggravated drunkenness (9%) was more than twice as great as it was in the rest of England and Wales (4%); and to charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence it was more than three times as great (11% and 3%).

*Charges of which there were less than 50 cases in the Inner MPD sample are omitted from the detail of the Table, but are included in the total.

Persons charged with damage to property, obstructing the police and disorderliness each included 8 to 10 % of women in the Inner MPD, compared with 3 to 5 % in the rest of England and Wales.

Women drunks charged in the Inner MPD thus form a slightly higher proportion of all those charged than they do either in the Outer MPD or the rest of England and Wales. In particular they form a substantially higher proportion of all those charged with aggravated drunkenness, and especially with drunkenness at the same time as another offence.

* * * * *

Further analysis shows that the proportions of males and of females charged in *Inner London* who showed some form of aggravating behaviour was almost identical (36 % of males and 37 % of females). In *Outer London*, however, the corresponding proportions were 41 % of males and 35 % of females. This *Outer London* pattern follows the general national trend, with men (67 %) considerably more likely to show aggravating behaviour than women (56 %).

* * * * *

Taking the MPD as a whole, we find that, in strong contrast to the rest of England and Wales, the degree of incapability among women is distributed in a closely similar way to that found among men:—

TABLE 23
Sex, analysed by degree of incapacity
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Degree of Incapacity	MPD		Rest of England and Wales	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Totally or nearly totally incapable	47	50	29	40
Partially incapable	44	43	36	33
Incoherent only	5	4	9	7
None of the above	4	3	26	20
Bases	12607	1067	32882	1686

In the MPD 47 % of the men and 50 % of the women charged were classified by the police as totally or nearly totally incapable. There were differences of only 1 % between the proportions of men and of women showing each of the three lesser degrees of incapacity. In the rest of England and Wales 40 % of the women charged were classified as totally or nearly totally incapable, compared with only 29 % of the men. And, outside the MPD appreciably more of the men (26 %) than of the women (20 %) showed none of the three overt signs of heavy intoxication.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that women charged in the MPD, especially in the inner area, show very similar patterns of behaviour to men:—

TABLE 24
Sex analysed by behaviour
Inner and Outer MPD

Behaviour	Inner MPD		Outer MPD	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
13. No aggravating behaviour	% 64	% 63	% 59	% 65
1. Physical violence	5	2	8	7
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	3	2	6	4
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	17	21	15	10
4. Insulting language or behaviour	7	12	9	15
5. Sexual behaviour	*	*	1	*
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult, etc.)	2	1	4	2
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	*	*	1	2
8. Damage to property	1	1	3	*
11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	7	2	8	2
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	1	1	2	4
Bases (number of persons)	9762	897	2844	170

Notes: Percentages add to more than 100% since two or more different types of behaviour could be exhibited by any one person.

In the Inner MPD men and women were equally prone to show some form of aggravating behaviour. Rather more of the women than of the men charged used insulting language or indulged in behaviour which is a nuisance to the public. Women were either rather less prone than men, or about equally prone to show each other form of aggravating behaviour.

In the Outer MPD the women charged were more prone than the men to show no aggravating behaviour. Nonetheless, the women were more prone than the men to use insulting language, and almost equally prone to aggressive behaviour or physical violence.

These differences are accentuated if we consider only those offenders who showed some form of aggravating behaviour. Table 25 gives these results for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

Comparing, first, the MPD with the rest of England and Wales:

1. *Males.* In the MPD male offenders with aggravating behaviour are markedly less prone to all the more frequent forms of behaviour, except general public nuisance behaviour, and urinating or vomiting, than are the male offenders in the rest of England and Wales.
2. *Females.* The same observations apply to female offenders, except that the proportions urinating or vomiting are the same for both areas.

These results confirm other indications that offenders in the MPD who do show aggravating behaviour tend to behave in a less violent, threatening or insulting way than do their counterparts in the rest of England and Wales. This may well be because they tend to be more manifestly drunk, and less capable of considered action.

TABLE 25
Behaviour of those showing any aggravating behaviour
Men and Women in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	Men		Women	
	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
1. Physical violence	15	25	8	22
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	11	19	6	13
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	46	36	54	30
4. Insulting language or behaviour	20	47	35	59
5. Sexual behaviour	2	1	2	2
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	6	11	4	9
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	1	2	2	1
8. Damage to property	4	10	3	9
11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	20	11	7	7
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	3	4	3	5
Base (number of persons with aggravating behaviour)	4647	22037	387	942

Secondly, comparing the sexes—

1. Women who show aggravating behaviour, both in the MPD and in the rest of England and Wales, use insulting language considerably more often than do men with aggravating behaviour.
2. Women who show aggravating behaviour are not quite so likely as men to damage property or to obstruct the police. But the difference is comparatively slight, both in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales.
3. In both areas women who show aggravating behaviour are less likely to use physical violence or threats than are men.
4. In the MPD "public nuisance" behaviour is more common among women offenders who show aggravating behaviour than it is among men. In the rest of England and Wales, the reverse is true.

(ii) Age

It has been shown (Section I, part v) that, within the five categories used in the annual statistics for offences of drunkenness proved, the distribution by age of the sample of persons charged in each type of police force corresponds closely with the distribution for the nearest complete calendar year, of those found guilty of such offences.

In the present report we shall be concerned with narrower age-bands, especially among the younger offenders, and on occasion with single years of age amongst the very young.

The following Table compares the distribution by age for the more detailed groupings we have used, of alleged offenders* in the samples from the MPD and from the rest of England and Wales:—

*Including those not charged with an offence of drunkenness, but under bye-laws etc. (3.8% in the MPD; 3.4% in the rest of England and Wales).

TABLE 26
Age distribution of persons charged
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

H

Age-group	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
13-17	1%	4%
18-19	3%	12%
20-24	12%	18%
25-29	12%	12%
30-39	21%	19%
40-49	24%	18%
50-59	16%	11%
60-69	5%	4%
70 and over	1%	1%
No information	5%	1%
Bases	13711	34642

The drunkenness offender in the MPD tends to be older than his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales. At least* 40% of alleged offenders in the MPD, compared with only 29% in the rest of England and Wales are aged between 40 and 59. The contribution to the total of those aged 60 and over, and of those aged 25 to 39, is approximately the same in the MPD as outside it. But the proportion of offenders who are aged under 25 is less than half as great in the MPD as it is in the rest of England and Wales.

The under 25's

In the rest of England and Wales there was a progressive decline in the contribution of persons of each year of age from 18 to 24 to the total number of persons charged. Table 27 compares this with the position in the MPD—

TABLE 27
Distribution of offenders aged 18 to 24

H

Age	Proportion of all offenders who were this age—			
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England & Wales
18	0.9%	2.7%	1.3%	6.3%
19	1.5%	3.0%	1.8%	5.4%
20	1.6%	3.2%	2.0%	4.4%
21	2.1%	3.9%	2.6%	4.3%
22	2.3%	3.6%	2.6%	3.7%
23	1.9%	2.9%	2.2%	3.0%
24	1.9%	3.4%	2.3%	2.8%
Bases (all offenders)	10670	3041	13711	34642
% of all offenders who were aged between 18 and 24	12.3	22.7	14.6	29.9

*Precise comparisons cannot be made because of the higher "no information" rate in the MPD.

In both the Inner and Outer MPD there was a progressive *increase* with each year of age in the contribution to the total of persons between the ages of 18 and 21, the reverse of the pattern for the rest of England and Wales. The trend is the same in both the Inner and Outer MPD. The overall contribution of young people of 18 to 24 to the total of offences was much less in the Inner MPD (12%) than in the outer MPD (23%), but even in the outer MPD it was much less than in the rest of England and Wales (30%).

Age and degree of incapacity

Outside the MPD it was found that the proportion of arrested drunks who showed total or near-total incapacity increased progressively with age (except among the comparatively small number of young people under the legal age for drinking in public houses, who were nearly as frequently incapable as those aged 25 to 29).

The following Table compares the results for the Metropolitan Police District with those for the rest of the country.

TABLE 28
Age and degree of incapacity: MPD and Rest of England and Wales

Age Group		Total and near-total incapacity		Partial incapacity		Incoherent only		Neither incapable nor incoherent		Bases* (MPD)
		MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	
1. 13-17	%	45	19	40	22	3	11	12	39	77
2. 18-19	%	32	11	59	25	7	11	11	43	428
3. 20-24	%	18	14	46	26	7	11	9	39	1573
4. 25-29	%	44	21	44	37	6	10	6	32	1574
5. 30-39	%	46	31	46	39	3	8	3	22	2896
6. 40-49	%	49	40	43	38	4	7	2	15	2217
7. 50-59	%	52	48	42	35	4	6	2	11	2212
8. 60-69	%	58	59	39	30	3	4	1	7	736
9. 70 and over	%	61	74	33	20	3	3	3	3	189
No information on age and/or degree of incapacity		%	49	44	38	31	7	4	17	746
Total	%	47	29	44	36	5	9	4	26	12708

The MPD shows the same *trend* as the rest of England and Wales: the proportion of arrested drunks who were totally or nearly totally incapable increases with age from the age of 18 upwards; and the proportion in this state of incapacity among those aged under 18 is approximately the same as it is among the 25 to 29 age-group.

But the trend is much less marked in the MPD than elsewhere, with differences of only 2-6% between consecutive groups after the age of 24, compared with differences of 8-15% in the rest of England and Wales.

Although the total proportion showing a high degree of incapacity is 47% in the MPD and only 29% elsewhere, by the age of 50-59 the likelihood of an arrested drunk being highly incapable is very similar in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales; and after that age the likelihood is *less* in the MPD than elsewhere.

*The bases for each of the nine age groups in the rest of England and Wales were:—(1) 143 6 (2) 4036; (3) 6341; (4) 4108; (5) 6470; (6) 6339; (7) 3709; (8) 1403; (9) 388. (No information 347) Total: 34597.

In the MPD a difference of only 2% was found between the age-groups 25 to 29 and 30 to 39, compared with a difference of 10% in the rest of England and Wales.

The next Table shows the results for the Inner and Outer sub-divisions of the MPD, respectively.

TABLE 29
Age by degree of incapacity: Inner and Outer MPD

Age Group		Total and non-total incapacity		Partial incapacity		Incoherent		Neither incapable nor incoherent		Bases (number of persons of this age)	
		Inner	Outer	Inner	Outer	Inner	Outer	Inner	Outer	Inner	Outer
13-17	N	(18)	(17)	(18)	(21)	—	(2)	(2)	(7)	(30)	(47)
18-19	%	39	23	47	34	7	8	8	15	255	175
20-24	%	41	31	46	45	5	11	7	13	1057	516
25-29	%	47	38	44	43	4	9	3	9	1145	429
30-39	%	48	38	45	50	4	6	2	6	2375	521
40-49	%	51	39	44	51	4	5	1	5	2670	607
50-59	%	53	45	42	46	3	3	1	3	1810	462
60-69	%	56	52	38	43	5	5	2	1	586	150
70 and over	%	60	49	30	42	3	3	2	4	152	57
No information on age	%	51	39	39	33	6	8	3	9	608	136
Total	%	50	38	43	47	4	7	3	8	10070	3041

The trend is the same in both the Inner and the Outer areas—the older the arrested drunk, the more likely he is to be completely or nearly completely incapacitated. But in the outer areas the difference between age-groups 25 to 29, 30 to 39 and 40 to 49 is negligible; and in the Inner areas it is very slight*.

The implications of these results are obscure. If we were to assume that the marked and steady increase of incapacity with age found outside London indicates a progressively diminishing tolerance of alcohol amongst regular drinkers (with or without changes in intake), then the implication would be that there is some characteristic of arrested drunks in London which tends to mask this trend. Some difference in drinking habits might be implied (e.g. that there is more sporadic intensive drinking amongst all age-groups, and less regular heavy drinking, in London than elsewhere).

But there is nothing in the present data to indicate whether or not the initial assumption of decreasing tolerance is a valid one, and the suggested hypothesis is given merely as an example of the sort of ground which might be covered in any research designed to differentiate between drinking habits in different areas.

Charges and age

The next Table compares the age distribution of alleged offenders faced with different charges, in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

*In the outer areas arrested drunks aged 70 and over appear to be no more likely to be highly incapable than those aged 60 to 69. However, the number in the former age-group in the sample is only 57 and little reliance can be placed on this result.

TABLE 30
Charges by Age 0-
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

C

Charge: Age Group	Simple drunkenness		Drunkenness with aggravations		Drunkenness with another offence		Disorderliness		Damage to property		Obstructing the police		Urinating, vomiting, etc.	
	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W
13-17	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
18-19	2	4	4	15	1	6	2	17	7	7	1	6	—	6
20-24	2	9	5	22	6	28	8	27	19	28	7	20	2	18
25-29	9	16	16	13	20	15	22	15	22	17	23	34	15	22
30-39	10	8	14	18	20	16	16	19	21	17	24	17	13	14
40-49	21	20	22	18	20	16	17	18	21	17	20	13	30	13
50-59	26	26	21	16	16	10	11	11	13	13	11	7	30	18
60-69	18	18	12	8	8	4	9	4	5	5	6	2	8	5
70 and over	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	3
Bases	9177	12430	3764	16891	282	4272	412	1197	125	1855	106	1360	53	142

*Less than 0.5%.

0- Charges represented by less than 50 cases in the MPD are omitted from this table.

Note: Percentages usually total less than 100% because cases where no information on age was available are omitted.

The age distribution of those charged with simple drunkenness is fairly similar in the MPD to that found in the rest of England and Wales.

The contribution of the young (under 25's) to each other type of charge is very much less in the MPD than in the rest of the country:—

Charge	Proportion of those charged who are aged under 25	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Simple drunkenness	11 %	15 %
Drunkenness with aggravations	21	41
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	27	41
Disorderliness	32	49
Damage to property	27	49
Obstructing the police	31	60
Urinating, vomiting	17	46

In the MPD between about one-fifth and one-third of those facing each charge except simple drunkenness and urination etc. are under 25; in the rest of England and Wales between about two-fifths and three-fifths fall into this age-group.

Comparison between the inner and outer areas of the MPD shows that young people contribute more to all of the three main types of charge in the outer areas—

TABLE 31
Contribution of those aged under 25 to each of the main types of charge
Inner and Outer MPD

Charge	Proportion of those charged who are under 25 years old		Bases	
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Inner MPD	Outer MPD
Simple drunkenness	9 %	17 %	7171	2006
Drunkenness with aggravations	19	34	3097	647
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	23	33	176	106
Disorderliness	24	40	182	230

The contribution of the young to each type of charge in the outer MPD is greater than in the inner MPD, but still substantially less (except for simple drunkenness) than it is in the rest of England and Wales.

(iii) Sex, age and charge

Table 32 (p. 68) is an analysis for each sex separately of the nature of the charge in relation to the age of the offender.

Men. In the MPD men aged under 25 constitute 16% of all male offenders, compared with 35% in the rest of England and Wales.

In the MPD this age group makes up 12% of male simple drunkenness offenders; 23% of male offenders charged with aggravated drunkenness only; and 27% of drunks facing other charges, with or without a drunkenness charge.

In the rest of England and Wales the rise in the contribution of the under-25's to each of the three types of charge is considerably steeper—from 16%, through 43% to 53%.

Those aged under 35 constitute 20% of all male offenders in the MPD and 38% in the rest of England and Wales. But they make up nearly half of male offenders charged with aggravated drunkenness in the MPD (48%) and about two-thirds (66%) of males facing this charge in the rest of England and Wales. Of male drunks charged with offences other than drunkenness 59% are aged under 35 in the MPD, and 77% in the rest of England and Wales.

At the other end of the age scale, we may consider those aged 55 and over:—

	Proportion of MALE offenders who are aged 55 and over		
	Charge—		
	<i>Simple drunkenness</i>	<i>Drunkenness with aggravations</i>	<i>Other charges with or without a drunkenness charge</i>
MPD	14%	8%	5%
Rest of England and Wales	18%	5%	3%

Women. Only 5% of women offenders in the MPD are under 25 years of age, compared with 16% of male offenders. 21% of female offenders in the rest of England and Wales are under 25 compared with 35% of male offenders.

Women offenders are also less commonly aged 25–34 than are men offenders. The overall contribution to male offenders of those aged under 35 is 39% and 57% in the MPD and in the rest of England and Wales, respectively. The corresponding proportions for women offenders are 20% and 38%.

As amongst men, the proportion of female offenders who are under 25 increases with the seriousness of the charge (4%, 6%, 9% in the MPD for the three main types of charge, respectively; 13%, 28% and 34% in the rest of England and Wales).

The overall contribution of the 25 to 34 age group to all female offenders is similar in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales. Women aged under 35 contribute 18%, 26% and 32% to the total of females charged with each of the three types of offence in the MPD; and 24%, 48% and 63% in the rest of England and Wales.

The contributions of women aged 55 and over to each type of offence are shown below—

	Proportion of FEMALE offenders who are aged 55 and over		
	Charge—		
	<i>Simple drunkenness</i>	<i>Drunkenness with aggravations</i>	<i>Other charges with or without a drunkenness charge</i>
MPD	28%	16%	14%
Rest of England and Wales	30%	7%	6%

Among women offenders those aged 55 and over make a similar contribution to the total of females charged with simple drunkenness in the MPD (28%) as they do in the rest of England and Wales. But they make a much larger contribution to the total of females facing more serious charges in the MPD, than is the case in the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 32
Charges analysed by sex and age
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Age Group	Men						Women					
	Simple drunkenness only		Drunkenness with aggravations		Other charges with or without drunkenness charges		Simple drunkenness only		Drunkenness with aggravations		Other charges with or without drunkenness charges	
	Total		Total		Total		Total		Total		Total	
	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W
Under 25	12	16	23	43	27	88	4	13	6	28	9	21
25-34	21	18	25	23	32	24	14	11	20	20	34	17
35-44	24	25	22	18	15	12	20	23	26	27	29	15
45-54	23	22	17	11	13	6	29	21	24	16	17	24
55-64	11	13	7	4	4	2	17	15	12	6	14	18
65-74	3	4	1	1	1	2	8	10	3	1	4	10
Over 74	*	1	*	*	*	*	3	5	1	—	1	6
No information	5	1	5	1	7	1	5	2	8	1	4	3
Bases	8442	11610	3421	16085	256	4086	727	810	293	689	22	141
			12119	31781							1042	1640

*Less than 0.5%

(iv) Marital status

In 18% of all cases in the MPD, and in 7% in the rest of England and Wales, no information was obtained about the marital status of the offender. The reason for this exceptionally high omission rate is obscure. It may perhaps be associated with a reluctance on the part of the police to inquire into an aspect of the alleged offender's private affairs which might not only appear irrelevant, but could be perceived as a potential threat by a married person. Such an explanation does not account, however, for the much higher rate of omission in the MPD, compared with the rest of England and Wales.

Examination of the omission-rate in relation to the degree of incapacity of the offender showed that there were no systematic differences in the MPD; but in both the MPD and the rest of England and Wales, the omission rate was lowest for offenders who were neither incapable nor incoherent (15% MPD; 5% rest of England and Wales). There was a consistent, but only slight, tendency for the proportion of omissions to increase systematically with degree of incapacity in England and Wales outside the MPD (from 5% amongst the most capable to 8% amongst the most incapable). In both areas omissions were most common amongst those charged with simple drunkenness only (20% MPD; 8% rest of England and Wales); and in the rest of England and Wales, but not in the MPD, omissions declined in frequency with the seriousness of the charge (8%, 6% and 3% for the three main types of charge, respectively).

The approachability of the offender at the time of charge thus appears to have had some effect on the likelihood of obtaining this piece of information. But reluctance by the police to ask for it is probably the most important influence*.

If we assume that omissions were unrelated to the actual or suspected marital status of the alleged offender, but primarily to a reluctance on the part of the police to ask about this subject, then the distribution by marital status of those for whom information was available, will approximate to the distribution among the whole of the samples. *The Table below can only be regarded as an approximation of the true position.*

TABLE 33
Marital status of those from whom this information was obtained

H				
Marital status of those for whom information was available	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Single	%	%	%	%
Married	60	64	61	61
Widowed, separated or divorced	34	31	33	32
	6	5	6	7
Bases (all for whom information on marital status was available)	8524	2558	11082	32183
Proportion of total for whom no information on marital status was available	20%	16%	19%	7%

*The rates of omission of information obtainable from the offender were, in general, considerably higher in the MPD than they were in the rest of England and Wales. But, for other items which entailed questioning the alleged offender, and which appear superficially to be no more easy or difficult to obtain, omissions were much less common than they were for marital status. E.g. information on employment status, country of birth and residential status were omitted in 8%, 8% and 4% of cases, respectively.

About one-third of offenders were married and an additional 6 to 7% were widowed, separated or divorced. About three out of five were single people. The results for the whole of the MPD and for the rest of England and Wales are almost identical, and there is very little difference between those for the Inner and Outer areas of the MPD.

Since any results related to differences in behaviour and other characteristics of persons of differing marital status can only be approximations, no further detailed analyses will be given. In the younger age-groups, who form a large proportion of offenders, the marital status of offenders is likely to be closely associated with their age. It is not surprising, since degree of incapacity has been shown to increase with age, that (among those whose marital status was known) married people were more often stated to be totally or nearly totally incapable than were single offenders, nor that rather more of those known to be married than of those known to be single were charged with simple drunkenness only.

(v) Residential status

The following Table shows the residential status of persons charged in the Inner and Outer MPD, in the MPD as a whole, and in the rest of England and Wales—

TABLE 34
Residential status of persons charged
MPD and Rest of England and Wales

H	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
	%	%	%	%
Permanent resident in area of reporting police force	54	63	56	60
Temporary resident in area	10	14	11	11
Normally resident elsewhere in British Isles	4	5	5	15
No fixed abode	26	12	23	12
Normally resident outside British Isles	1	2	1	1
No information	5	4	4	1
Base	10670	3041	13711	34642

In both the Inner and Outer areas the majority of persons charged (54% and 63%) were permanent residents in the Metropolitan Police District. An additional 10 to 14% were temporarily resident within the MPD. The corresponding proportions for the rest of England and Wales fall between those for the Inner and Outer areas of the MPD, and do not differ markedly from either.

The Metropolitan Police, of course, cover a more populous urban area than any other police force. Nonetheless the concept of a "visitor to London" can be seen as analogous to that of a visitor to any smaller town. It is, perhaps, surprising to find that the proportion of arrested drunks whose place of residence was outside London (but in the British Isles) was only 4 to 5% in both the inner and outer areas of the MPD. The contribution of day-visitors to London to the total number of offenders is small.

Alleged offenders in Inner London are distinguished, not by the proportion of non-resident "visitors" they include, but by the very large proportion who have no fixed abode (26%, compared with 12% both in outer London and in the rest of England and Wales).

Table 35 shows, for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales, the residential status of those charged with each of the three main types of offence:—

TABLE 35
Charges by residential status

Charge	Residential status						Bases
	Permanent resident in area	Temporary resident in area	Resident outside British Isles	No fixed abode	Resident outside British Isles	No information	
<i>Simple drunkenness</i>							
MPD %	54	10	5	25	1	5	9177
Rest of England & Wales %	53	13	14	18	1	1	12430
<i>Drunkenness with Aggravations</i>							
MPD %	58	12	5	21	1	3	3744
Rest of England & Wales %	63	10	16	9	2	1	16891
<i>Drunkenness at same time as another offence</i>							
MPD %	56	16	4	14	4	6	282
Rest of England & Wales %	66	11	15	7	1	*	4272

*Less than 0.5%

In the MPD 25% of those charged with simple drunkenness were persons of no fixed abode. So were 21% of those charged with aggravated drunkenness, and 14% of those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence. The corresponding proportions for the rest of England and Wales were 18%, 9% and 7%.

(vi) Country of birth

Table 36 shows the country of birth of persons charged in Inner and Outer London, and in the rest of England and Wales.

Only 28% of those charged in the Inner MPD were English by birth, and only 35% of those charged in the outer areas. This compares with 68%* native-born in the rest of England and Wales.

The difference is nearly all attributable to the high proportion of Irish-born among those charged in both the Inner (40%) and the Outer (42%) areas of the MPD. The corresponding proportion in the rest of England and Wales is 16% 28 to 31% of all arrested drunks in both the inner and outer parts of the MPD were born in Eire, and 11 to 12% in Northern Ireland.

*68% is the sum of the English-born charged in England (outside the MPD) and the Welsh-born charged in Wales.

TABLE 36
Country of birth of offender
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

H.

Country of Birth	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
	%	%	%	%
England	28.1	35.3	29.7	65.4*
Wales	1.9	1.8	1.9	4.2†
Scotland	11.5	8.9	11.0	8.1
Northern Ireland	12.0	10.9	11.7	4.4
Eire	28.1	31.3	28.8	11.7
Poland	2.1	0.9	1.8	1.2
Lithuania	0.2	—	0.2	0.3
Other European countries	1.7	0.7	1.4	1.4
India	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5
Pakistan	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Other Asian countries	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1
West Indies	2.6	1.9	2.5	0.4
Rest of American continent	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.2
Africa	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.4
Australasia	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1
No information	9.1	5.0	8.2	1.5
Bases	10670	3041	13711	34642

*Includes English-born charged in Wales (0.4%)

†Includes both Welsh-born charged in Wales (3.0%), and Welsh-born charged in England (1.2%)

More of the arrested drunks in inner London were born on the European continent (especially in Poland) than was the case either in the outer MPD or in the rest of England and Wales; and more were born on the American continent (mainly the West Indies). But the contribution of natives of any one country outside the U.K. and Eire, exceeded 2% only in the case of West Indians (2.6%) and the Polish-born (2.1%) in Inner London.

* * * * *

The Table overleaf shows for the MPD as a whole, and the rest of England and Wales, persons showing each of the main types of behaviour. Minorities have been grouped together as "European" (3% MPD, 2% rest of England and Wales); and "Others" (5% and 2%).

This Table illustrates such differences as exist in the behaviour-patterns of arrested drunks born in different countries. In the MPD these differences are slight, and lend little support to common stereotypes of the different drunken behaviour of people from different countries. (Such differences may, of course, exist amongst the intoxicated population of the MPD as a whole, but are not manifest amongst those arrested by the police.)

It is noteworthy, in particular, that in the MPD, amongst those showing no aggravating behaviour persons from each country are represented in identical or near-identical proportions to those in which they occur among all arrested drunks.

TABLE 37

Behaviour of persons charged, analysed by country of birth
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

County of Birth		England		Scotland		Wales		N. Ireland		Ire		Europe		Others		No inf.		Rest	
		MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W
13. No aggravating behaviour	%	29	57	11	10	2	4	12	6	29	15	4	4	4	2	9	2	2649	11600
1. Physical violence	%	30	71	12	6	1	4	13	5	31	11	3	2	4	2	7	1	711	5634
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	%	37	70	10	7	1	5	11	3	25	10	4	2	4	2	8	1	517	4197
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	%	31	70	10	7	2	4	11	4	23	9	3	2	7	2	7	1	2543	8144
4. Insulting language or behaviour	%	18	70	14	7	2	5	9	4	19	9	3	2	6	2	9	1	1075	10958
5. Sexual behaviour	%	31	75	10	4	1	4	14	3	31	8	1	3	4	3	5	1	78	334
6. Obstructing the police (forc. verbal assault etc.)	%	39	77	10	5	4	4	11	3	23	6	2	1	4	2	7	1	293	2392
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	%	31	69	9	10	5	5	12	3	31	13	4	2	4	1	6	1	65	431
8. Damage to property	%	33	70	12	6	1	4	11	4	23	11	3	2	5	1	7	1	221	2312
11. Urine, vomit etc.	%	28	65	10	7	3	5	10	4	33	12	3	3	6	2	7	2	971	2470
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	%	37	76	14	6	1	2	10	2	26	7	1	3	5	2	6	1	138	846
Total % of persons		30	65	11	8	2	4	12	4	29	12	3	2	5	2	6	1	3371	34397

*Less than 0.5%.

Minor differences in the behaviour of MPD offenders born in different countries are:—

1. *The English born* constitute 30% of all offenders, and between 28% and 39% of those displaying each type of behaviour, and no aggravating behaviour.
They make a rather greater contribution (37–39%) to insulting language and behaviour; threatening behaviour; and obstruction of the police, than they do to other forms of behaviour.
2. *The Scottish-born* constitute 11% of all arrested drunks, and between 9% and 14% of those displaying each form of behaviour.
They make a very slightly greater contribution to insulting language and behaviour than they do to other forms of behaviour.
3. *The Welsh-born* constitute only 2% of arrested drunks. Their contribution to petty theft and police obstruction is rather greater (4–5%) than it is to other sorts of behaviour.
4. *Those born in Northern Ireland* constitute 12% of all arrested drunks and between 9% and 14% of those showing each form of behaviour. They make a marginally smaller contribution to insulting language and behaviour (9%) than to any other act.
5. *Those born in Southern Ireland* constitute 29% of arrested drunks, and 23–33% of those showing each different sort of behaviour *except* insulting behaviour and language. To this they contributed only 19%, thus following to a more marked degree the tendency *not* to use insult which appears amongst those born in Northern Ireland.
Apart from this their smallest contributions were to threatening behaviour and obstruction of the police (25% and 23%); and their largest to urinating vomiting, etc. (33%).
6. *Other European-born* persons, and those born outside Europe, constitute 8% of arrested drunks. The contribution of both these groups to sexual behaviour associated with drunkenness, and to petty theft and fraud were negligible. There was little difference in their contribution to other forms of behaviour.

But nearly all these differences are small; the outstanding result in the MPD is the comparative uniformity in the reported behaviour of arrested drunks, regardless of the country of birth.

The only exception of appreciable magnitude is the tendency among those of Southern Irish birth *not* to use insulting language.

In the rest of England and Wales:

1. *The English born* made up 65% of all offenders, but only 57% of those showing no aggravating behaviour. They contributed 70% or more to the majority of types of aggravating behaviour, their greatest contribution (77%) being to obstructing the police. (This was also the form of behaviour to which the English-born contributed most in the MPD).
2. *The Scottish born* make up 8% of all offenders, but 10% of those with no aggravating behaviour, and of the small "petty theft and minor fraud" groups (which consists mainly of people who neglect or refuse to pay bills or fares). They contributed 6–7% to each other form of behaviour, except sexual behaviour (4%) and obstructing the police (5%).

3. *The Welsh-born* contributed 4-5% to each form of aggravating behaviour, and to those showing no aggravating behaviour.
4. *Those born in Northern Ireland* made up 4% of all offenders, but 6% of those showing no aggravating behaviour. They contributed 3-4% to each form of aggravating behaviour.
5. *Those born in Southern Ireland* made up 12% of all offenders, but 15% of those showing no aggravating behaviour. They contributed 11-12% to physical violence, damage to property, and vomiting and urinating. (The first and third of these sorts of behaviour are ones to which they also made a larger contribution in the MPD than they did to other types of behaviour). Their smallest contribution (6%) was to obstructing the police (which was also one of the two items to which they made the smallest contribution in the MPD).
6. *Others of European birth* made up 2% of all offenders, but 4% of those showing no aggravating behaviour. They contributed 1 to 5% to each form of aggravating behaviour.

* * * * *

Table 38 shows the distribution of the three main types of drunkenness charge among offenders born in different countries. For present purposes, all countries in Europe outside the U.K. and Southern Ireland have been hlocked together, as have all non-European countries.

TABLE 38
Country of birth and the three main types of charge

Charge	COUNTRY OF BIRTH						
	England	Scotland	Wales	N. Ireland	Eire	Rest of Europe	Rest of World
<i>MPD</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Simple drunkenness only	70	69	71	71	69	69	61
Drunkenness with aggravations	28	29	28	27	29	29	37
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Bases	3908	1454	246	1549	3820	465	671
<i>Rest of England and Wales</i>							
Simple drunkenness only	32	47	42	50	47	49	40
Drunkenness with aggravations	54	43	44	41	44	44	50
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	14	9	14	9	10	7	10
Bases	21985	2712	1362	1465	3937	971	698

Note: (i) Since this Table is concerned only with the three main types of offence (i.e. those included in the annual statistics for offences of drunkenness), the bases are smaller than they are in the subsequent Table, which concerns the whole sample.

(ii) 1120 cases in the MPD; and 471 in the rest of England and Wales, in which the country of birth was not ascertained by the police are omitted from this Table.

In the MPD the uniformity of the pattern of behaviour of persons from different countries is reflected in the nature of the charges made against them. Natives of each of the four countries in the United Kingdom, of Eire, and of the rest of Europe all include $69 \pm 2\%$ of simple drunks, $28 \pm 1\%$ of aggravated drunks, and 2% of persons charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence. For persons born outside Europe and charged in the MPD, however, the proportion charged with aggravated drunkenness (37%) is considerably higher.

In the rest of England and Wales, there are more marked contrasts between persons born in different countries. In rank order the proportions charged only with simple drunkenness are:

Northern Ireland	50%
Miscellaneous European countries	49
Eire	47
Scotland	47
Wales	42
Non-European	40
England	32

The English-born were much less frequently charged only with simple drunkenness than were persons born in other countries, and those born in Northern Ireland marginally more than those from other countries.

The degrees of incapacity of persons born in different countries is shown (for the whole sample) in Table 39.

TABLE 39
Country of birth and degree of incapacity

Degree of Incapacity	COUNTRY OF BIRTH						
	England	Scotland	Wales	N. Ireland	Eire	Rest of Europe	Rest of World
<i>MPD</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total or near-total incapability	45	42	46	44	51	50	50
Partial incapability	44	49	46	48	41	46	42
Incoherent only	5	5	5	5	5	3	5
None of these	5	4	3	3	4	1	3
Bases	4074	1501	257	1610	3955	470	724
<i>Rest of England and Wales</i>							
Total or near-total incapability	29	39	32	42	45	44	43
Partial incapability	38	42	38	44	40	40	40
Incoherent only	8	7	7	6	6	4	6
None of these	25	13	23	8	9	12	11
Bases	22636	2784	1464	1507	4035	989	711

Note: 1120 cases in the MPD, and 471 in the rest of England and Wales in which the country of birth was not ascertained by the police are omitted from this Table.

Bases are larger than in the preceding table which concerns only the three types of offence included in the annual statistics of drunkenness offences. The present table also includes the "borderline cases" already referred to.

In the MPD, $42 \pm 2\%$ of those born in England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland were rated by the police as totally or nearly-totally incapable. About half ($50-51\%$) of those born in Eire, the rest of Europe, and outside Europe, respectively were rated at this extreme. Differences between the proportions rated as merely incoherent ($4 \pm 1\%$), or neither incoherent nor incapable ($3 \pm 2\%$) were marginal. $45 \pm 4\%$ of each group in the MPD were rated as partially incapable. Again, the general pattern for each group in the MPD is fairly uniform.

In the rest of England and Wales—

1. *The English-born* were both less frequently rated as totally or nearly totally incapable than any other group (29%), and were also the most often rated as neither incoherent nor even partially incapable (25%).
2. *The Welsh born* were distributed in a similar way to the English born with 32% totally or nearly totally incapable, and 23% neither incoherent nor incapable.
3. *The Scottish born* were rather more often highly incapable than the English or the Welsh-born (39%), and considerably less often in neither an incapable nor incoherent state (13%).
4. *Those born in Northern Ireland and Eire* were more often highly incapable (42% and 45%), and less often neither incapable nor incoherent (8% and 9%) than were the English, Welsh or Scottish born.
5. *Those born on the European continent, and those born outside Europe* were each distributed between the different degrees of incapability in much the same way as were the Southern Irish.

The results from the two areas agree in showing the Southern-Irish born offenders, and those born in Europe and outside it, to be more often very incapable than those born in any of the four countries of the United Kingdom. But the markedly higher level of capability of the English and Welsh born, which was found in the rest of England and Wales was not manifest at all in the MPD.

* * * * *

The comparative uniformity of the results in the MPD is open to more than one interpretation, but it is consistent with the suggestion already made that the Metropolitan Police may, of necessity, be obliged to confine their attention principally to the most "obviously" drunk—those manifesting at least some clear sign of incapability.

Among those charged in the MPD only between 4% and 10% of persons from each country or group of countries were not classified as at least to some extent incapable. That is, the very great majority had *at least* reached the stage of "tottering; staggering; being supported by friends; supporting themselves against wall etc. at intervals; being a danger to themselves or others through lurching into the roadway etc."

In the rest of England and Wales, on the other hand, substantial and widely different proportions of offenders from different countries (between 8% and 25%) were classified as neither incapable nor even incoherent.

Assuming a similar continuum of drunken behaviour in the MPD as elsewhere in England and Wales, the necessity for the Metropolitan police to select mainly the "worst" cases would tend to obscure real differences in the behaviour of persons from different countries who were technically liable to be charged.

* * * * *

Minorities

Among the minorities who contribute comparatively little to the sum total of charges, the West Indian and African-born included the highest proportions charged with aggravated drunkenness both in the MPD (42% and 38%, compared with a total for all offenders of 28%, and a range of between 25% and 36% for each of 13 other countries or groups of countries); and in the rest of England and Wales (57% and 64%, compared with a total of 50%, and a range of between 34% and 55% of persons from each of 13 other countries or groups of countries).*

The Polish-born were the most frequently charged with simple drunkenness—marginally so in the MPD, more markedly in the rest of England and Wales (59%, compared with a total for all offenders of 37%, and a range of between 32% and 51% for the remaining countries or groups of countries).

* * * * *

Note: In the second Table (Table 37) in this section we have shown the contributions made to each type of behaviour by persons born in different countries. This indicates the overall size and nature of the problems presented to the police in dealing with drunks from these countries. Subsequent tables have shown the distribution of charges and capability ratings amongst those from each of the main countries. This is a more precise indicator of the differences between those born in different countries, but, in the case of minority-groups, might tend to convey a false impression of the magnitude of the problem they presented to the police.

The uniformity of the behaviour-patterns of offenders in the MPD, born in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Eire and the rest of Europe, already suggested by Table 37, is shown even more clearly if we consider separately the behaviour of those born in each of these seven places. (i.e. same data as Table 37, but percentage downwards).

Behaviour	Range of proportions behaving in this way amongst those born in England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Eire, and the rest of Europe, respectively (MPD offenders)	
13. No aggravating behaviour	61-65%	
1. Physical violence	3-6%	
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	2-5%	
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	16-18%	
4. Insulting language or behaviour	8-10%	except among those born in N. Ireland (6%) and Eire (5%) (less than 0.5% amongst the Welsh-born)
5. Sexual behaviour	1%	except amongst those born in Miscellaneous European countries (1%)
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	2-4%	
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	Never in excess of 1%	
8. Damage to property	1-2%	
11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	6-9%	
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	Never in excess of 1%	

*These proportions in this and the following paragraph are based on those in the sample who were charged with an offence of drunkenness.

Those born outside Europe and charged in the MPD include only 53% with no aggravating behaviour, but they too fall within the ranges given above for each single type of behaviour except public nuisance behaviour (24%).

The pattern outside the MPD is affected principally by wide differences in the proportions of persons from different countries who showed no aggravating behaviour. This ranges from 29% of those born in England, to 46% of those born on the European continent (i.e. outside the U.K. and Southern Ireland).

(vii) Employment status and country of birth

The next Table compares the distribution of offenders of differing employment status in the Inner and the Outer MPD, and in the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 40
Employment Status
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Employment status	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Manual	41	55	44	58
Retired	3	4	3	2
Unemployed	25	15	23	22
Casual or seasonal workers	13	9	12	5
Seamen	1	3	2	4
H.M. Forces	*	*	*	2
Other employment (including housewives)	10	8	9	4
No information	8	6	8	3
Bases	10670	3041	13711	34642

*Less than 0.5%

Both unemployed and casual or seasonal workers constituted a greater proportion of all offenders in the Inner MPD than they did in the Outer MPD. Together they make up 38% of all offenders in the Inner MPD, compared with 24% in the Outer.

In the MPD as a whole the proportions who were unemployed at the time of the incident (23%) is almost identical with that found in the rest of England and Wales (22%). But the MPD includes a much higher proportion of seasonal and casual workers (12%) than does the rest of England and Wales (5%).

44% of offenders in the MPD were regularly employed manual workers, compared with 58% in the rest of England and Wales.

Clerks; professional people and management; and salesmen and shop assistants each made up at least three times as great a proportion of offenders in the MPD as they did in the rest of the country (in aggregate 3.9% in the MPD, and 1.3% in the rest of England and Wales). This accounts for a considerable part of the difference between the two areas in the proportions classified as in "other employment".

Table 41 shows the distribution by employment status of those charged with each type of offence in England and Wales outside the MPD, and for each type for which more than 50 cases occurred in the MPD sample.

TABLE 41

Charges and Employment Status
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Charges	Manual		Retired		Unemployed		Casual or seasonal		Scarcen		H.M. Forces		Others		No information		Bases	
	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W
1. Simple drunkenness only	42	50	4	4	24	27	12	6	2	4	*	1	8	5	8	3	9377	12410
2. Drunkenness with aggravations	%	61	2	1	22	20	13	5	2	5	*	2	9	4	6	3	3744	14891
3. Drunkenness at same time as another offence	%	65	2	1	20	18	10	5	2	3	1	2	7	4	8	2	202	4272
7. Damage to property	%	62	2	1	13	30	7	5	2	4	1	2	15	4	6	2	125	1855
12. Obstructing the police	%	69	3	0	18	16	8	4	2	3	1	3	7	4	9	2	106	1360
6. Disorderliness	%	65	2	1	16	16	9	6	1	3	*	2	8	5	6	1	412	1195
11. Indecent language	%	64	1	1	13	13	7	7	3	3	2	2	4	4	4	2	136	573
4. Assault	%	70	0	0	14	14	5	5	5	5	2	2	3	3	3	2	31	337
3. Theft	%	60	1	1	23	23	6	6	2	2	6	6	2	2	2	1	250	194
5. Possessing offensive weapon	%	69	0	0	17	17	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	6	1	1	10	150
9. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	%	61	—	—	4	16	15	4	4	4	—	7	12	4	6	4	54	142
10, 13, 14. Others	%	73	*	*	13	13	1	1	1	1	2	2	8	8	—	1	100	212
Total	64	54	3	2	25	22	12	5	2	4	*	2	8	4	3	3	14011	38615

Trends shown among the retired, unemployed, and casual or seasonal workers tend to be similar and in the following comments, therefore, we consider these three groups together, and compare them with currently employed manual workers in regular jobs.

Manual Workers

Offenders amongst manual workers in regular employment tend towards the more active manifestations of drunkenness. In the MPD they constitute 44% of all offenders and contribute 42%, 46% and 50% to each of the three main types of charge, respectively. In the rest of England and Wales they constitute 58% of all offenders, and contribute 50%, 61% and 65% to each of the three main types of offence. They contribute disproportionately to each type of specific charge. Outside the MPD manual workers in regular employment constitute 58% of all offenders, but between 69% and 70% of those charged with assault, possessing an offensive weapon, and obstructing the police. In the MPD sample the number of cases was too small for comparison for the first two of these items, and although manual workers there constitute 44% of all offenders, but 52% of those charged with obstructing the police, there is no indication that they are especially prone to this charge, as distinct from their generally high contribution to all charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence. In the MPD they make a particularly large contribution to charges concerned with vomiting and urinating.

Unemployed: casual and seasonal workers and the retired

Offenders in these groups tend towards the more passive manifestations of drunkenness. In the MPD they constitute 38% of all offenders, and 40%, 37% and 32% of those charged with each of the three main types of offence. In the rest of England and Wales, the corresponding figures are:—overall contribution to all offences 29%; contribution to the three main types of drunkenness offence 37%, 26% and 24%. Outside London they contribute least to the specific charges indicative of violence—obstructing the police; assault; and carrying an offensive weapon (20%, 19% and 18%). The number of such charges in the MPD is too small for reliable comparison.

Employment and country of birth

Those in regular employment who committed their alleged offence in their country of birth were as follows:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Offence committed in England (outside the MPD); offender in regular employment and born in England | 44% of all offenders in England (outside the MPD). |
| 2. Offence committed in Wales; offender in regular employment and born in Wales ... | 34% of all offenders in Wales. |
| 3. Offence committed in Outer MPD; offender in regular employment and born in England ... | 21% of all offenders born in England. |
| 4. Offence committed in Inner MPD; offender in regular employment and born in England ... | 12% of all offenders born in England. |

Only a minority of offenders were in regular employment and in their country of birth at the time of committing their offence. The proportions were particularly small in both the Outer and Inner MPD.

(viii) *Numbers of persons involved: the solitary London offender*

In the MPD as a whole 86% of alleged offenders were alone at the time of the incident—that is they were not accompanied by any other person, whether charged or not. The corresponding proportion in the rest of England and Wales was 67%.

One reason for the greater solitude of London offenders is, of course, that a much higher proportion of them were simple drunks, incapable, and assumedly arrested for their own protection. 91% of persons charged with simple drunkenness were on their own at the time of apprehension in the rest of England and Wales; 94% in the Inner, and 88% in the Outer, MPD.

But there was a tendency for persons in all the three main charge-groups to be more often alone, and less often in the company of two or more other people, in the MPD than elsewhere. In the Inner MPD, the difference is particularly marked:—

TABLE 42
Number of persons accompanying those charged
The three main charge-groups
Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Charge and number accompanying person charged	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales
	%	%	%
<i>Simple Drunkenness</i>			
No one accompanying	94	88	91
One person accompanying	3	7	6
Two or more persons accompanying	1	2	2
No information	2	3	1
Bases	7171	2006	12430
	%	%	%
<i>Drunkenness with aggravations</i>			
No one accompanying	79	62	56
One person accompanying	12	19	21
Two or more persons accompanying	7	16	21
No information	2	3	2
Bases	3097	647	16890
	%	%	%
<i>Drunkenness at the same time as another offence</i>			
No one accompanying	72	62	46
One person accompanying	11	18	22
Two or more persons accompanying	13	17	27
No information	4	4	4
Bases	176	106	4272

For simple drunks the difference between areas are marginal. 94% of those charged with simple drunkenness in the inner MPD were on their own, compared with 88 to 91% in the outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

For those charged with aggravated drunkenness the proportion of offenders who were on their own was appreciably higher in the inner MPD (79%) than the outer (62%), and again higher in the outer MPD than in the rest of England and Wales (56%).

The corresponding proportions for those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence were 72%, 61% and 46%.

The MPD, and the inner part of the MPD in particular, is thus characterised by solitary, unaccompanied, offenders, partly as a result of the preponderance of incapable simple drunks, but also because aggravated drunkenness offenders and multiple offenders as well are more often on their own than they are in the rest of England and Wales.

* * * * *

Behaviour of solitary offenders

Table 43 shows the proportions of those alleged offenders behaving in different ways who were entirely unaccompanied (i.e. had no-one at all with them, whether charged or not). The Inner and Outer MPD are compared with the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 43

Behaviour of solitary offenders*

Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	Proportion of those behaving in this way who were unaccompanied			Bases		
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales
No aggravating behaviour	94%	88%	91%	6854	1794	11600
Physical violence	51	45	31	474	237	5634
Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	65	61	51	333	184	4197
General "public nuisance" behaviour	82	61	53	1863	480	8144
Insulting language or behaviour	80	62	57	787	288	10958
Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc)	71	44	37	177	116	2392
Damage to property	68	60	52	135	86	2322
Urinating, vomiting etc.	91	71	73	727	243	2470

*Behaviour represented by less than 50 cases in the Inner and/or Outer MPD samples is omitted from this Table.

Note: The above figures are based on the whole sample, including those (4% in the Outer MPD; 2% in the Inner MPD and the rest of England and Wales) for whom no information was available on whether they were accompanied or not. Some slight exaggeration of differences may arise from the fact that the proportion of cases for which no information was available was consistently slightly greater (5-7%) for those showing aggressive behaviour, and those obstructing the police (4-6%) than it was for other types of behaviour.

There is a consistent tendency for each type of behaviour for the proportion of solitary drunks to be greater in the Inner MPD than in the Outer, and (with the exception of urination) for the proportion to be greater in the Outer MPD than in the rest of England and Wales.

Those showing aggressive behaviour or using physical violence are the least likely to be on their own, but in the inner MPD just over half were solitary (compared with less than a third in England and Wales outside the MPD).

Those obstructing the police were among the least likely to be on their own in the outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales, but were not markedly prone to solitude in the inner MPD.

Apart from those showing no aggravating behaviour, drunks using insulting language show a general tendency to solitude, but again markedly more so in the Inner MPD (82%) than in the Outer (61%) or in the rest of England and Wales (53%).

* * * * *

The generally greater tendency to solitude amongst alleged offenders, other than simple drunks, in the MPD, and particularly in the Inner MPD, may perhaps to be attributed in part to the more manifest signs of intoxication (incapability and incoherence) which characterise those charged in the MPD. Persons who have not yet reached the stage of incoherence are much less common amongst aggravated drunks in the MPD than elsewhere. It is probable that once the stage of incoherence is passed, a drunk tends to become (and/or to feel himself to be), uncongenial company, and to be left by, or to leave, his companions. Alternatively, offenders in the MPD may more often *start* drinking in solitude than they do in the rest of England and Wales.

Table 44 shows the proportions in each state of incapacity who were alone at the time of apprehension.

TABLE 44
Distribution of solitary offenders among those with differing degrees of incapacity
Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Degree of Incapacity	Proportion who were solitary			Bases		
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales
Total or near-total incapacity	94 %	85 %	91 %	5281	1157	10071
Partial incapacity	86	77	67	4617	1426	12553
Incoherent only	74	65	56	466	213	2934
Neither incapable nor incoherent	54	55	43	301	228	9007
No information	—	—	—	5	17	32

The lesser his degree of incapacity, the lesser is the likelihood of an alleged offender being companionless at the time of his apprehension. This is true for both the inner and outer MPD and for the rest of England and Wales.

However, we see again the now familiar tendency for the offender arrested in the Inner MPD to be more likely to be on his own, regardless of his state, than the offender in the Outer MPD. Amongst all but the totally and near-totally incapacitated, the offender in the outer MPD is also more likely to be on his own than is the offender in a comparable state in the rest of England and Wales.

There appear, then, to be at least two variables affecting the comparative solitude of the London offender:

- i regardless of the charge against him, he is more likely to be more overtly drunk than his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales. (The more overt his drunkenness, the more likely is an offender to be on his own).
- ii there is some characteristic of the Metropolitan Police District which leads offenders in any condition but total or near-total incapacity to be on their own more frequently than is the case elsewhere. If this were the case, it would be particularly a characteristic of the Inner part of the MPD.

It would be unwise to draw any firm conclusions from the above, but the results are at least consistent with the possibility that London, especially Inner London, is characterised by the presence of more heavy, and more lone, drunks than the rest of the country.

* * * * *

It is not surprising to find that simple drunkenness offenders are nearly always on their own. But, given that drinking is very frequently a social activity, it is interesting to find that other drunkenness offenders, too, are so often solitary at the time the police find them. Interpretation is uncertain, but the following hypotheses would merit consideration in any research designed to distinguish between the drunkenness offender and the heavy drinker who does not offend against the law:

- i that after he has passed a certain point in his drunken behaviour, a drunk may tend to be an embarrassment to his fellow drinkers and so get left on his own.
- ii that finding himself alone after a social occasion may lead a drunk to behave more offensively than he would in the presence of his companions.
- iii that the behaviour of one drunk in a party of drinkers can usually be kept within reasonable bounds by the rest of the party—consequently the behaviour of the solitary drunk is more ostentatious than that of an equally drunk person in the company of others.
- iv that drunkenness offenders, as distinct from the drunken population as a whole, tend to be solitary drinkers.

Numbers apprehended or reported as the result of a single incident

The following Table shows for the Inner and Outer MPD, and for the rest of England and Wales, the proportion of persons charged as an outcome of incidents leading to the apprehension or reporting of one, two, and three or more persons.

In the Inner MPD only 5% of all those charged were charged as a result of incidents in which one or more others were charged as well. The corresponding proportions in the Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales were 12% and 22%, respectively.

TABLE 45

Persons charged as a result of incidents in which only one; two; and three or more persons were charged

Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

C

Number of different persons charged as result of incident	Proportion of all persons who were charged as a result of incidents in which this number of different persons were charged		
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England and Wales
One person only charged	% 94	% 90	% 78
Two persons charged	4	8	14
Three or more charged	1	3	8
Bases	10670	3041	34597

In the next Table the proportions of alleged offenders who were accompanied by anyone (whether also charged or not) are compared with the proportions one or more of whose companions were also charged as a result of the same incident.

TABLE 46

Persons accompanied by others and persons charged together with others involved in the same incident

Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

(Three main types of charge compared)

H

Whether accompanied and whether charged together with one or more others involved in the same incident	Simple Drunkenness			Aggravated Drunkenness			Drunkenness at same time as another offence		
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of England & Wales
Accompanied by one or more persons (whether or not charged)	4%	9%	8%	19%	35%	42%	24%	35%	49%
Charged together with one or more others involved in the same incident	2%	4%	4%	11%	21%	30%	13%	19%	35%

If an alleged offender is accompanied at all, the likelihood that one or more of his companions will also be charged as a result of the same incident are high. This, of course, is in no way surprising—there would probably be no need to bring a charge against *anyone* in many instances in which part of a group cooperated with the police in quelling a drunk's behaviour, or assisting an incapable drunk on his way.

In the MPD the lesser likelihood of more than one person being charged as a result of the same incident is a joint outcome of the lesser likelihood of alleged offenders of all three types being accompanied by anyone at all and the preponderance in the MPD of simple drunks, who are comparatively rarely accompanied by anyone either in the MPD or elsewhere in England and Wales.

(ix) **Physical injury and personal material loss***

Drunkenness offenders in the MPD were even less likely than those in the rest of England and Wales to cause any physical injury or loss of personal property to anyone. Details are shown in Table 47 overleaf.

In all, in the MPD, 96% of alleged offenders caused no injury or personal loss to anyone; 3% injured or caused loss only to themselves or their associates. Under 1% caused loss or injury to strangers, and under 1% to officials other than the police.† In the rest of England and Wales 89% caused no loss or injury to anyone; 6% only to themselves or their associates; 2% to strangers; and 3% to police officers.

The slight disparity between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales lies, as Table 47 shows, largely in the greater preponderance of simple drunkenness offenders in the MPD. Not surprisingly simple drunks do occasionally injure themselves, but the injury or loss they inflict on others is negligible.

But those charged with aggravated drunkenness are almost as unlikely as simple drunks to inflict injury or personal loss on anyone other than themselves or their associates. 95% of them in the MPD, and 92% in the rest of England and Wales, inflicted no injury or personal loss on anyone at all; a further 4 to 5% only on themselves or their associates.

For charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence, the results for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales are almost identical—but, of course, multiple charges form a much smaller proportion of the total in the MPD.

62% of all persons facing multiple charges had caused no physical injury or personal loss to anyone—and a further 11 to 12% to no-one but themselves or their associates.

Police officers (18% in both the MPD and the rest of England and Wales) were the outside group most frequently injured or suffering personal loss at the hands of those charged with multiple offences, followed by strangers to the alleged offender (8% and 9%). Officials other than the police suffered personal loss or injury in 1–2% of cases where there was a multiple charge.‡

Charges of damage to property

The results here indicate that in 62% of cases (in both the MPD and the rest of England and Wales) when a charge of damage to property was made, no *personal loss* or injury was suffered, and in a further 18% and 13% of cases (in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales respectively) either the loss occurred among the associates of the offender or he or his associates were injured. In 13 to 14% of cases strangers to the offender lost personal property and/or were injured; and in 5% of cases in the MPD and 10% elsewhere in England and Wales the police suffered personal loss or injury.

*It should be noted that the question referred to *loss of personal property*, and was not intended to cover damage to property or loss (by theft etc.) of public or corporate property.

†The precise figures are 0.6% and 0.7%, for strangers and officials, respectively.

‡It will be seen that in no instance, for any of the three main charge groups (except MPD multiple charges: 1%), are personal enemies of the offender the victims of injury or personal loss in more than 0.5% of cases.

This fact is open to more than one possible interpretation. It could imply that a more serious charge, without one of drunkenness, is usually made against anyone who injures a personal enemy, even though he is drunk at the time. It certainly has one clear implication—namely, that incidents in which mutual enemies hurt one another contribute negligibly to the official statistics of drunkenness offences.

TABLE 47

Charge in relation to persons suffering any physical injury or personal loss
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

C

Charge	PERSONS SUFFERING LOSS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY OR INJURY							
	No one	Offender and/or associates only	Spouse or relative	Strangers to offender (members of the public)	Personal enemies of offender	Police officers	Officials etc. other than police	Bases
1. Simple drunkenness only	MPD % Rest E/W % 98 95	2 4	0 *	* *	0 *	0 *	* 0	9177 12430
2. Drunkenness with aggravations only	MPD % Rest E/W % 95 92	4 5	* 1	1 1	* *	1 1	* *	3744 16891
3. Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	MPD % Rest E/W % 62 62	12 11	1 1	8 9	1 *	18 18	1 2	282 4272
7. Damage to property	MPD % Rest E/W % 62 62	18 13	0 1	14 13	0 1	5 10	2 3	125 1855
12. Obstructing the police	MPD % Rest E/W % 41 36	9 13	1 1	0 5	2 *	57 55	1 2	106 1560
Total, all charges (including those not listed above)	MPD % Rest E/W % 96 89	3 6	* *	1 2	* *	* 3	1 *	13711 37557

*Less than 0.5%

Note: (i) Percentages may add to over 100% because in some cases there was more than one victim.

(ii) Since some people were charged with more than one offence other than drunkenness the victimisation reported was not invariably a source of the 3 specific charges described at the end of the Table.

It may be inferred that charges of damage to property by intoxicated persons comparatively rarely refer to any loss of personal property. Assumedly then, the property damaged must usually either be "public" property (such as any of the numerous glass, wooden or metal objects to be seen in any public highway) or the property of a company or other body rather than of an individual (e.g. all types of property belonging to, or part of, public houses).

Obstructing the police

The results for the MPD are again closely similar to those for the rest of England and Wales. In 55-57% of cases in which such a charge was brought one or more police officers suffered injury or loss. In only 41% of cases in the MPD and in 36% in the rest of England and Wales where a charge of obstructing the police was brought did no one at all suffer injury or personal loss.

Thus, in the considerable majority of cases (about three out of five in which charges of obstructing the police were brought against drunks), some injury or loss had been caused to someone, and in more than half of all such cases a police officer had been among the victims.

It appears, therefore, that charges of obstructing the police are for the most part made against drunks only when the infliction of injury or personal loss form part of the drunk's behaviour.

Further analysis shows that, in the MPD, a charge of obstructing the police was made against only 36% of those offenders who were reported to have resisted their own arrest, to have attempted to "rescue" someone else from arrest, and/or to have attacked a police officer. The corresponding proportion in the rest of England and Wales was 57%. The Metropolitan Police thus appear less inclined than those in the rest of England and Wales to make an additional charge of obstruction when a drunk's behaviour might make such a charge tenable.

* * * * *

The extent to which victims suffered personal loss or injury is relevant to three types of charge represented only by small numbers—insufficient in the MPD for any reliable conclusion to be drawn. These are charges of assault, possessing an offensive weapon, and of theft. The results for these three charges in England and Wales outside the MPD are given in Table 48.

TABLE 48
Charge in relation to persons suffering any injury or personal loss
England and Wales outside MPD

Charge	Persons suffering injury or loss of personal property							Bases
	No one	Offender or associates only	Spouse or relative	Stranger(s) (members of public)	Personal enemies	Police officers	Other officials	
Assault %	10	15	9	50	6	15	10	337
Theft %	69	6	—	16	—	7	4	198
Possessing offensive weapon %	71	11	1	11	1	7	2	150

Note: Percentages add to over 100% because in some cases there was more than one victim of injury or personal loss.

In 90% of cases outside the MPD in which an *assault* charge was brought someone had suffered injury.* This was most usually (50%) a stranger (a member of the general public). Quite frequently police officers (15%) and other officials (10%) were the victims. In 9% of cases the victim was the spouse or a relative of the offender.

Charges of assault are thus rarely made against drunks unless an actual physical injury had been inflicted.

In 69% of cases in which a charge of *theft* was made, no one lost personal property, and the victims were most usually strangers. This is consistent with the fact that the sort of behaviour which could lead to such a charge was most usually failure or refusal to pay a fare or bill—which would not entail loss of personal property. (The fact that charges of theft are associated in 7% of cases with victims in the Police Force probably implies that the police suffered injury in the course of dealing with the incident, rather than that they were themselves victims of loss of personal property).

In 71% of cases in which a drunk was charged with *possessing an offensive weapon*, no one was injured or lost their personal property. There were 150 persons charged with possessing an offensive weapon, in the sample outside the MPD, and 152 who were stated to have used a weapon (cf. Table 49).

(x) Carrying and using weapons

The following Table (49) shows the proportion of all those charged in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales who were in possession of any offensive weapon, and whether it was used or not. In this particular context, the fact of carrying an offensive weapon would be so important that it seems reasonable to assume that when the police recorded no information as to whether an alleged offender was carrying one or not, he was not carrying one.

TABLE 49
Carrying and use of offensive weapons

Did offender use or have in his possession an offensive weapon?	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Carried weapon, did not use	0.31	0.52	0.36	0.89
Used weapon	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.43
Had no weapon	91.47	91.15	91.40	95.48
No information recorded	8.15	8.29	8.12	3.18
Bases (all persons charged)	10670	3041	13684	34642

In the MPD about one offender in every 250 carried an offensive weapon, and about one in 2,500 used it. Outside the MPD about one in 75 carried a weapon, and more than one in 250 used it. The differences are consistent with the generally less violent nature of the behaviour of those charged in the MPD.

*The comparative frequency with which there was more than 1 type of victim injured when an assault charge was made seems likely to reflect the vulnerability of the police as second victims when they are attempting to rescue the original victim.

(xi) Medical treatment known to the police

In the planning stages of this inquiry some misgivings were expressed about the advisability of asking the police, as part of a routine, to *question* alleged offenders about whether or not they had ever been treated for alcoholism or any nervous disorder. In order to obtain a minimal figure for those who had received such treatment the phrase "none or none known" was used to cover both those who were not asked about this subject, and those who were asked and denied having had treatment. The "no information" category, used elsewhere, was purposefully omitted so that police officers should not be obliged to say whether or not they had actively sought the information.

Of those charged in the MPD 2.1% were either already known by the police to have had treatment for alcoholism (with or without treatment for other disorders) or stated after questioning that they had had such treatment; an additional 0.7% were either known to have had, or stated that they had had treatment for other nervous disorders only.

The overall proportion stated to have had treatment for alcoholism and/or other nervous disorder was virtually identical in the MPD (2.8%) and in the rest of England and Wales (2.9%). This correspondence may be coincidental, since it is known that the Metropolitan Police less often questioned offenders on other items than did the police in the rest of England and Wales.

All that can be said with certainty about these results is that they show that *at least* one in every thirty-five charges of drunkenness in the whole of England and Wales are made against people who have had treatment for alcoholism and/or some other nervous disorder.* The true proportion may well be much greater, but cannot be ascertained by the present method.

(xii) Previous convictions known to the local police

Police were asked to state, for each person charged, whether he or she was *known to them* to have had any previous convictions for offences of drunkenness, and, if so, how many. They were also asked to state whether the alleged offender was known to have had any previous conviction(s) for offences other than those of drunkenness.

The police were expressly instructed to base their statements *on local knowledge*. This was agreed to be essential in the planning stages of the inquiry, since reference to central records in each case would have been a very onerous task both for the police and for those in charge of the records.

It is important to emphasise what the results measure. They are in essence an indicator of the offenders' notoriety amongst the local police. They do not give any clear indication of the actual overall proportion with records of previous offences. Those with records known to the local police will probably tend to be those who have been charged locally and appeared in local courts. The proportion of all offenders with a previous record whose record is known to the local police is likely to vary between one type of community and another. We should expect it to be high in a relatively small closed community whose members did most of their drinking in the locality; and low in large urban areas where drinkers

*This figure relates to *charges*, not to the number of persons charged. Since persons known to have had treatment also tend to be known to have had several previous convictions, the same individual may appear more than once in a sample covering 18 months.

travel considerable distances for their drinking and other pleasures, not drinking regularly in any one locality—or which are much frequented by persons from outside the area on occasional visits.

Of the persons charged in the MPD only 12% were known to the local police (i.e. the police in the sub-division concerned) to have had previous convictions for offences of drunkenness, and only 9% to have had previous conviction(s) for other offence(s). The total proportion known to have had any previous conviction was 17%.

In the rest of England and Wales the corresponding proportions were: previous drunkenness offence(s) 35%; other offences 36%; any type of offence 49%.

The extreme differences, in the proportions with convictions known locally, between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales may well be largely attributable to the special nature of the MPD sub-divisional areas, many of which are likely to attract visiting drinkers from various other parts of London, who, though not known locally, may have had a record of offences committed outside the area.

Bearing these qualifications as to the implications of the results in mind, the following Table compares the results from the MPD and the rest of England and Wales in respect of the proportions of all alleged offenders known to the local police to have had previous convictions either for drunkenness offences, for other offences, or for both.

TABLE 50

Persons charged who were known to the local police to have a previous record of convictions

Previous convictions known to the local police	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
None	82.7	50.9
For offence(s) other than drunkenness offence(s) only	5.2	13.6
For drunkenness offence(s) only	8.2	12.6
For drunkenness offence(s) and other offence(s)	3.6	22.9
Bases	13711	34597

In view of the qualifications described above, it can only be stated that, outside the MPD, at the very least nearly half of all persons charged had a previous record of convictions—and this includes more than one-third who had convictions for offences other than offences of drunkenness (with or without a record of drunkenness offences as well).

It will be noticed that in the MPD the proportion known to have had previous drunkenness convictions only greatly exceeds the proportion known to have a record of both drunkenness and other offences, whereas in the rest of England and Wales the reverse is the case. This appears to be consistent with the fact that the drunkenness offender in the MPD tends to be much more often incapable than his counterpart in the rest of England and Wales:—it seems reasonable to suppose that those liable to drink up to the state of incapability would be less likely to commit other offences than those whose drunkenness offences are of a more active nature.

Any further interpretation of these results would be highly speculative in view of their source in "local knowledge". But one negative inference perhaps merits attention: in the MPD the very great majority of persons apprehended for drunkenness are *not* people already known to the local police as previous offenders of any kind.

The police were asked to state the *number* of drunkenness convictions against any alleged offender who was known by them to have had any such previous convictions. In all but 8.6% of cases in the MPD where previous conviction(s) were known, and in all but 1.2% in the rest of England and Wales an exact figure was given. It appears, therefore, that if this part of a person's record is known at all to the local police, it is nearly always known precisely. For this reason, it seems that a valid *comparison* can be made between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales in respect of the *number* of previous drunkenness convictions against those known to have any such record. The results are shown in Table 51.

TABLE 51
Number of previous convictions for offences of drunkenness of those known to the local police to have any such convictions

C		
Number of previous convictions for drunkenness	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
1	19.7	26.9
2	15.8	14.8
3-5	24.2	21.0
6-10	14.1	12.7
11-25	11.2	11.9
26-50	3.3	7.1
Over 50	1.4	4.1
Previously convicted but number of times not known	8.6	1.2
Bases (those known to have previous convictions for drunkenness)	1654	12276

In the MPD of those known to have had previous convictions for drunkenness about one in five had only one such known conviction, while in the rest of England and Wales rather more than a quarter had only one known previous conviction. But the proportion with a very high number of previous convictions (over 25) was considerably lower in the MPD (4.7% of those known to have had previous convictions) than it was in the rest of England and Wales (11.2%).

The following Table (52) relates the proportions of persons charged who were known by the local police to have had varying numbers of previous convictions to the proportions known to have been convicted of offences other than drunkenness.

TABLE 52

Number of previous convictions for drunkenness known to the local police by whether any previous convictions known for other offences

C

Number of known previous convictions for drunkenness		No non-drunkenness convictions known		Non-drunkenness conviction(s) known		Base	
		MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
None known	%	94	79	6	21	12057	22321
1	%	86	51	14	49	326	3302
2	%	76	43	24	57	261	1817
3-5	%	31	34	69	66	400	2572
6-10	%	50	27	50	73	234	1566
11-25	%	45	19	55	81	185	1466
25 or more	%	32	25	68	75	78	1384
Previous convictions, but number not known	%	74	38	26	62	143	169
Total		91%	63%	9%	37%	13711	34597

In the MPD 6% of those not known to the local police to have had any previous convictions for offences of drunkenness, were known to have been convicted for other offences. The corresponding proportion was much higher in the rest of England and Wales (21%). This difference may imply no more than that outside the MPD the local police are more likely to know of the previous non-drunkenness conviction record of persons charged with drunkenness than they are in the sub-divisions of the MPD. On the other hand, the difference is not inconsistent with the relatively exuberant type of alleged drunkenness offender found outside the MPD, compared with the incapable and older type found in the MPD.

Outside the MPD the results show a regular pattern. In each group, up to a previous record of 11 to 25 drunkenness convictions, the likelihood of an offender also being known to have been convicted for a non-drunkenness offence increases. About half of those known to have had one drunkenness conviction were also known to have had at least one conviction for another offence; about two-thirds of those with 3 to 5 known previous drunkenness convictions; and about four out of five of those with 11 to 25 such previous convictions. The proportion falls off slightly (to three quarters) amongst those with a very large number of previous drunkenness convictions.

In the MPD there is a steep rise with number of drunkenness convictions known in the proportion known to have been convicted of other offences, up to the level of 3 to 5 drunkenness convictions. (14% of those with only one known previous drunkenness conviction; 24% of those with two such convictions; and

69% of those with 3 to 5 such convictions.) Half or more of those with known previous drunkenness convictions in the ranges 6-10, 11-25, and 26 or more also have known convictions for non-drunkenness offences—but the proportion with other convictions only reaches the figure for those with 3-5 drunkenness convictions at the highest level of all (26 or more previous convictions for offences of drunkenness). The number of cases at this level in the MPD is very small (78), and the result unreliable.

It will be seen that at the level of 3-5 known drunkenness convictions the proportion with other known convictions is approximately the same in the MPD as it is in the rest of England and Wales (69% and 66%). At all other points the proportions are less in the MPD than outside it.

Because of the source of the data (local police knowledge), these results cannot be interpreted with any confidence.

Two extreme assumptions might be made:

1. The local police appear nearly always to know the exact number of previous drunkenness convictions when they know about a person's previous convictions for drunkenness at all. From this we might infer that if a person's criminal record is known locally at all, it is likely to be known completely. On this assumption, the relationship found between the number of his known drunkenness convictions and whether or not a person has a record of other offences would, in itself, indicate a real trend (though still, of course, with the proviso that the results concern only those persons known to the local police).
2. Alternatively, the likelihood of the police knowing about an alleged drunkenness offender's previous record for *non-drunkenness* offences may increase with the number of his previous drunkenness offences. If this were the case, the results would merely indicate that the better an alleged drunkenness offender is known locally for one type of illegal behaviour, the better he is known for any other type of illegal behaviour in which he may have indulged. This assumption is not wholly inconsistent with the tendency (mainly found in the MPD) for the proportion of known drunkenness offenders with other known convictions to fall off after a given point in the number of previous drunkenness convictions. It may well be that habitually arrested drunks are in fact less prone to commit other offences than are those with a relatively small number of drunkenness convictions.

It is not within the competence of the present writer to say which of these assumptions is correct, or whether a combination of the two may operate.

* * * * *

(xiii) Celebrations

The police were asked to provide information in answer to the following question:

"Was the offender celebrating any special occasion, or drinking on account of any event?"

They were instructed that information on *parties* etc. not held on account of any particular occasion or event was *not required*, and such occasions were to be entered as "None".

The eighteen months' period covered by the inquiry in the MPD included only one Christmas and New Year season, whereas the period covered in the rest of England and Wales covered two. The results from the two areas are, therefore, not directly comparable in respect of celebrations of national festivities.

TABLE 53
Celebration of special occasions and events
(other than parties etc. not held on account
of any particular occasion or event)

H

Occasion or event	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
1. None, or none divulged	% 93.9	% 91.7	% 93.4	% 90.2
2. Sporting event	1.6	0.9	1.5	0.8
3. Wedding, birthday, funeral or similar domestic event	2.2	3.9	2.5	2.9
4. Christmas, New Year or other national festivity	1.4†	1.7†	1.5†	4.6‡
6. Release from prison	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2
7. Reunions/farewells	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.4
9. Works/office parties etc. §	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
8. Dances †	*	*	*	0.1
5. Other event	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.4
No information entered by police	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.1
Bases (no. of persons)	10670	3041	13711	34642

*Less than 0.5%.

†18-month period of inquiry includes one Christmas/New Year season.

‡18-month period of inquiry includes two Christmas/New Year seasons.

§Items 7 and 9. The greater frequency with which celebratory works parties and celebratory dances are mentioned in England and Wales outside the MPD may result from the inclusion of two Christmas/New Year seasons in the period of inquiry in the former area.

Only 7% in the MPD and 10% in the rest of England and Wales were known to be celebrating any special occasion or event, and the difference is largely accounted for by the inclusion of two Christmas/New Year seasons in the period covered outside the MPD.

Celebration of national festivities will be referred to again shortly. Apart from these, domestic events such as weddings and birthdays were the most commonly named occasions of celebration (2.5% MPD; 2.9% rest of England and Wales). Sporting events were being celebrated by 1.6% of persons charged in the Inner MPD, but by only about half this proportion elsewhere. Reunions and farewells were known to be reasons for celebration by 0.2% in the MPD and 0.4% elsewhere. Celebratory works or office parties were comparatively seldom named, and celebratory dances very rarely indeed.

It is of some interest to note that a consistent proportion of between about one in a thousand and one in five hundred alleged offenders were known to be celebrating their release from prison.

* * * * *

In common with a number of other questions, the results of this question were separately analysed for each of the three six-monthly periods of the inquiry. The period November-April which occurs once in the sample for the MPD, and twice in the sample for the rest of England and Wales, includes both the Christmas/New Year season, and each of the three national saints' days for Ireland, Wales and Scotland, respectively. Excluding Wales,* in all types of force (City, Borough and County; Inner and Outer MPD) outside this period only between 0.1 and 0.2% were said to be celebrating a national festivity.

The results for the 6-month periods which include the principal national festival days were as follows. (These results exclude Wales).

Type of Force	Proportion celebrating national festivity 6 monthly periods Nov. to April	
	Nov-April 1964/5	Nov-April 1965/6
English City forces (excl. MPD)	4.8%	5.1%
English Borough forces	7.2%	7.6%
English County forces	9.3%	9.8%
Inner MPD	(Not included in period of inquiry)	3.9%
Outer MPD		5.2%

No inference can be drawn from this table as to the *annual* incidence of alleged offences committed while celebrating national festivities; and the incidence in a calendar year would in any case be misleading, because New Year celebrators taken in charge after midnight on December 31st of one year would fall into the next calendar year's charges. The Table shows that in a six month period which includes the major national festivities, including the three expatriates' national Saints' Days, the proportion of persons charged who were known to be celebrating a national festivity ranged from about 9% in the County forces to about 4% in the Inner MPD.

(xv) Type of Drink consumed

It is clear that the police, both in the MPD and elsewhere, found difficulty in obtaining information (or at least information which they considered reliable), on the types of drink consumed by alleged offenders. No information was obtained on this subject in 24% of cases in the MPD, and in 15% in the rest of England and Wales. There was no difference between the Inner and Outer MPD in the overall proportion of cases in which this information was not obtained.

In the Inner MPD, however, the *more* incapacitated the alleged offender was the *more* likely was there to be information on the type of drink he had consumed.

Inner MPD	
Degree of Incapacity	Proportion with information on type of drink consumed
Total or near-total incapacity	80%
Partial incapacity	73%
Incoherent only	71%
None of the above	67%

*4.0% in the sample from Wales were said to be celebrating a national festivity during the period May to October. The meaning of this result is obscure.

This trend was not found in the rest of England and Wales (14 to 16% "No Information" for each of the above categories), or in Outer London.

In view of the deficiencies and unevenness in the data, only approximate statements, in terms of minimal proportions, can be made.

The following points merit consideration:—

1. The *minimum* proportions of offenders who had drunk mixed types of drink, or single-type drinks other than beer were 28% in the Inner MPD, 27% in the Outer MPD, and 24% in the rest of England and Wales. In view of the much higher "no information" rate in the MPD, the true contrast between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales may be greater than it appears from these minimal figures.
2. Amongst the *totally incapacitated* in both the Inner and Outer MPD at least 32% of offenders had drunk mixed types of drink or a single type other than beer. The corresponding minimal proportion in the rest of England and Wales were 25%; and again the true figures would probably show a greater contrast because of the higher no-information rate in the MPD.
3. There was little difference in the minimal figures for *partially incapable* offenders (at least 24 to 26% had either mixed their drinks or drunk a single type of drink other than beer).
4. For the merely *incoherent* the minimal figures for the three areas differ substantially:—
 - *Inner MPD*. At least 35% had either mixed their drinks or drunk a single type of drink other than beer. (The no-information rate in this group was very high—29%, so the true proportion is likely to be well in excess of 35%).
 - *Outer MPD*. 25%—with a lower no-information rate (21%).
 - *Rest of England and Wales* 20%—with a still lower no-information rate (14%).

In view of the differences in the no-information rates it is likely that the true figures would show an even greater contrast between areas than these minimal ones.

5. For those who were *neither incapable nor incoherent* the minimal proportions who had mixed their drinks or drunk a single type of drink other than beer were 26%, 19% and 13% for the three areas, respectively ("No information" rates—33%, 28% and 15%).

Again, in view of the difference in the no-information rates it is probable that the true figures would show a greater contrast between areas than the minimal ones.

Mixed drinks. The proportion of offenders *known* to have mixed their drinks was the same in the Inner and Outer MPD and in the rest of England and Wales (12%), the most usual mixture being beer and spirits. There is no evidence from the data of any appreciable relationship between mixed drinks and degree of incapacity:

Totally incapable—13 to 14% in each of the three areas known to have mixed their drinks.

Partially incapable 10 to 12%

Incoherent only 11 to 17%

None of the above 9 to 12%

The possibility cannot be ignored, however, that these apparent similarities may mask differences due to a non-random distribution of the no-information groups. Although the data lend no support to the hypothesis that offenders who mix their drinks are liable to be more manifestly drunk than others, they do not entirely preclude the possibility.

* * * * *

The drinks consumed by men and women offenders, respectively, in the Inner and Outer MPD, and in the rest of England and Wales, are shown in detail in the next Table.

TABLE 54
Sex, by type of drink consumed
Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Type of drink	MALES			FEMALES		
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of E and W	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest of E and W
Beer only	49%	50%	63%	31%	21%	37%
Wine (incl. "wine" ciders and perries)	5	4	4	21	14	17
Cider only	2	*	1	3	1	1
Spirits only	7	8	4	15	30	12
Meths. only	1	1	1	1	1	1
Beer with spirits	8	10	8	3	5	5
Other mixtures	4	3	4	4	3	7
No information	24	23	15	22	27	20
Bases	9760	2844	32882	897	170	1686

*Less than 0.5%

The proportion of male offenders *known* to have drunk wine, cider or spirits only is 15% in the Inner MPD, 13% in the Outer MPD and 10% in the rest of England and Wales. Taking into consideration the higher "no information" rates in the MPD, the real difference between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales may be greater than these figures indicate. Similarly, the approximately equal proportions of male offenders in all three areas *known* to have mixed their drinks (12 to 13%) may mask real differences hidden in the "no information" groups.

At least 40% of women offenders in the Inner MPD, at least 45% in the Outer areas, and at least 31% in the rest of England and Wales had consumed wine, cider or spirits only; the minimal proportions known to have mixed their drinks were 7%, 8% and 12%.

These results are not conclusive, in view of the number of cases in which no information was obtained on the type(s) of drink consumed. The following

negative statements may, however, be made conclusively—with the proviso that the true proportions are almost certainly considerably higher than those stated:

1. At least 27% of male offenders in the Inner MPD; at least 26% in the outer MPD, and at least 22% in the rest of England and Wales were *not* drunk on beer alone.
2. At least 47% of female offenders in the Inner MPD, at least 53% in the outer MPD, and at least 43% in the rest of the country were *not* drunk on beer alone.

Age and Type of drink consumed

Table 55 shows the age distribution of offenders in the MPD known to have consumed each type of drink; and Table 56 gives the same information for the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 55
Age analysed by type of drink
Total MPD

Age Groups	Beer	Wine	Cider	Spirits	Meths.	Other single drink	Beer/ Spirits	Other mixed drinks	No inf.	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	(N)	%	%	%	%
13-17	0.6	0.6	—	1.4	—	—	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.6
18-19	4.0	0.8	0.4	3.3	—	—	4.1	0.9	2.1	3.1
20-24	13.8	4.4	2.1	8.8	1.9	—	16.9	5.5	9.6	11.5
25-29	12.9	7.9	7.4	10.2	1.0	—	16.5	6.1	9.8	11.5
30-39	22.2	20.2	22.5	18.8	13.5	(2)	22.8	18.4	20.0	21.1
40-49	22.2	30.6	31.9	23.7	38.5	—	20.3	33.3	24.4	23.9
50-59	15.0	21.0	27.0	18.9	21.2	(1)	10.6	21.4	16.3	16.1
60-69	5.2	6.9	5.6	7.1	7.7	—	3.4	5.7	5.4	5.4
70 and over	1.2	1.8	1.4	2.2	3.8	—	0.8	1.7	1.5	1.4
No information	2.8	5.6	1.8	5.5	12.5	—	4.0	6.6	10.6	5.3
Bases	6537	770	285	1075	104	(3)	1127	543	3241	13685

TABLE 56
Age analysed by type of drink
England and Wales (excluding the MPD)

Age Groups	Beer	Wine	Cider	Spirits	Meths.	Other single drink	Beer/ spirits	Other mixed drinks	No inf.	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	(N)	%	%	%	%
13-17	4.1	4.8	5.9	4.8	—	(2)	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.2
18-19	13.5	5.0	5.9	6.5	0.3	—	11.1	7.1	10.6	11.7
20-24	20.0	8.2	7.7	14.9	1.3	—	21.0	11.9	18.1	18.3
25-29	12.5	8.4	8.5	9.1	1.3	—	13.8	7.5	12.3	11.9
30-39	18.4	18.5	17.8	20.8	15.1	(1)	19.5	20.3	18.9	18.7
40-49	17.0	25.7	22.3	24.0	31.2	—	17.4	24.4	17.7	18.4
50-59	9.3	18.1	21.8	12.2	29.3	—	9.3	16.2	11.1	10.7
60-69	3.5	7.2	8.8	4.7	15.4	(1)	2.6	6.8	4.0	4.1
70 and over	1.0	2.6	1.1	1.8	4.4	(1)	0.5	1.2	1.1	1.1
No information	0.7	1.3	0.5	1.1	1.3	—	0.9	0.2	2.0	0.9
Bases	21377	1705	376	1676	317	(5)	2632	1404	5093	34585

The most immediately apparent trend shown by these Tables is the differing contributions by the young (under 25) to offenders made drunk by different drinks.

Thus in the MPD of those offenders known to be beer drinkers, spirit drinkers, or mixers of beer and spirits nearly 5% are aged under 20. For other single drinks, and for mixed drinks apart from beer and spirits, the proportion falling in this age-group is of the order of 1% or less.

Amongst offenders who mix beer and spirits about 17% are aged 20 to 24; amongst offending beer-only drinkers the proportion is nearly 14%; and amongst spirit drinkers about 9%. For each other single drink and for mixed drinks apart from beer with spirits the proportion ranges from $5\frac{1}{2}\%$ to 2%.

A similar pattern is found in the rest of England and Wales, but with much higher proportions of all offenders falling into the age-groups concerned.

If we consider the contribution of the very young (aged under 25) and that of the middle-aged and old (50 and over) to the consumers of each type of drink, the results shown in the following Table are obtained. In the left-hand half of the Table the drinks are ranked in order of the proportion of their drinkers who are aged under 25 in the MPD. In the right-hand half the drinks are ranked in order of the proportion of their drinkers in the MPD who are aged 50 and over. (It will be observed that the rank orders are slightly different in the rest of England and Wales, but never differ by more than one place).

TABLE 57

Contribution of those aged under 25, and of those aged 50 and over,
to all offenders stated to have consumed each type of drink
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

C

THE YOUNG			THE MIDDLE-AGED AND OLD			
Drink	Proportion of all offenders known to have drunk this drink who were aged under 25		Proportion of all offenders known to have drunk this drink who were aged 50 and over		Drink	
	MPD	Rest of E and W	MPD	Rest of E and W		
1. Beer and spirits mixed	22%	36%	34%	32%	Cider	1.
2. Beer	18	38	33	49	Methylated spirits	2.
3. Spirits	14	26	30	28	Wine	3.
4. Mixed drinks other than beer/spirits	7	23	29	24	Mixed drinks other than beer/spirits	4.
5. Wine	6	18	28	19	Spirits	5.
6. Cider	3	20	21	14	Beer	6.
7. Methylated spirits	2	2	15	12	Beer and spirits	7.
Proportion of all offenders who fall into this age-group	15	34	23	16		

The greatest proportion of offenders under the age of 25 are found among drinkers of beer and spirit mixtures, beer only and spirits only. Conversely the smallest proportions of offenders aged 50 or more are found among consumers of these drinks.

The greatest proportions of offenders aged 50 and over are found among cider, methylated spirit, and wine drinkers. Conversely, the smallest proportions of offenders aged under 25 are found among consumers of these drinks.

Differences in the age distribution of offenders known to have consumed different types of drink are very considerable. This must be borne in mind in evaluating the following tables which show some differences in the behaviour of those who had consumed different types of drink. If the young are assumed to be by nature more aggressive than the old, the slight association between aggressive behaviour and the consumption of those drinks most favoured by the young need imply no more than an association between youth and aggressiveness.

We next consider the behaviour of those known to have consumed each type of drink, Table 58 gives this information for the MPD.

TABLE 58
Behaviour analysed by type of drink
MPD

C	Beer	Wine	Cider	Spirits	Meths	Beer/ spirits	Other mixed drinks	No inf.	Total
Behaviour	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
13. No aggravating behaviour	63.1	60.9	66.7	66.0	76.9	57.6	62.4	64.2	63.1
1. Physical violence	4.8	3.8	3.9	4.5	2.9	8.7	4.4	5.7	5.2
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour	3.8	2.5	1.4	4.1	4.8	6.2	3.5	3.3	3.8
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	18.3	20.0	16.1	14.7	12.5	17.1	18.6	14.9	17.1
4. Insulting language or behaviour	5.6	13.2	7.0	10.1	6.7	9.0	14.2	9.0	7.8
5. Sexual behaviour	0.6	0.8	—	0.4	—	0.4	1.3	0.5	0.6
6. Obstructing the police	1.8	3.1	1.4	1.6	1.9	3.5	2.2	2.3	2.1
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	0.4	0.5	—	1.0	—	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.5
8. Damage to property	1.4	1.7	0.7	2.1	1.0	2.7	0.7	11.8	1.6
11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	7.4	3.9	7.0	5.2	1.9	9.2	7.9	7.0	7.1
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	0.9	1.0	—	0.8	—	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.0
Total	6537	770	285	1075	104	1127	543	3241	13711

The last two columns of this Table show that the behaviour patterns of those for whom no information was available on the type of drink they had consumed differ only slightly from those of the sample as a whole. The nature of the alleged offenders behaviour at the incident does not, therefore, appear to have been of any major importance in determining whether or not information was obtained on the drink(s) consumed.

The first impression given by this Table is one of a fairly close similarity between the nature of the behaviour of those who had consumed each type of drink. The principal exception is the small group of methylated spirit drinkers, who show no aggravating behaviour much more often than any other group, and are less prone to use physical violence, to be generally boisterous ("public nuisance" behaviour) and to urinate or vomit than are consumers of any other drink. They are rather more prone than the sample as a whole to display threatening or aggressive behaviour, but less prone to any of the remaining types of behaviour.

However, the apparent uniformity of behaviour shown in this Table is partly the outcome of the very high proportions of drinkers of all types of drink who show no aggravating behaviour. Indeed, regardless of what type of drink they have consumed, the great majority of drunkenness offenders in the MPD are simple drunks. The contrast between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales in this respect is shown below:—

TABLE 59
"No aggravating behaviour" in relation to
type of drink consumed

Drink	Proportion of offenders who had drunk this drink and showed no aggravating behaviour.		Bases	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Beer only	63 %	30 %	6537	21377
Beer and spirits mixed	58	36	1127	2632
Other mixed drinks	62	39	543	1404
Wine only	61	43	770	1705
Cider only	67	45	285	376
Spirits only	66	51	1075	1676
Methylated spirits only	77	58	104	317

If we consider only those who *did* show some form of aggravating behaviour, some differences between offenders in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales still remain. These are shown in Table 60.

In the following comments methylated spirits drinkers have not been considered, because the numbers showing aggravating behaviour in the MPD sample are too small. *All percentages quoted are of those showing aggravating behaviour:*

Physical violence. In the MPD this is particularly common amongst beer and spirit mixers (21 %), but not among drinkers of beer only or any other type of drink (10-13 %).

TABLE 60

Aggravating behaviour in relation to type of drink consumed
(Those showing aggravating behaviour only)
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	DRINK(S) CONSUMED									
	Beer	Wine	Cider	Spirits	Methylated spirits	Beer and spirits	Other mixed drinks	No information	Total	
1. Physical violence	MPD Rest E/W	% 10 15	% 12 15	% 13 19	% 10 10	% 21 28	% 12 22	% 16 22	% 14 24	
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour	MPD Rest E/W	6 15	4 17	12 20	16 16	15 23	9 20	9 16	10 18	
3. General "subtle nuisance" behaviour	MPD Rest E/W	51 44	48 36	43 33	40 40	40 38	50 44	42 36	46 35	
4. Insulting language or behaviour	MPD Rest E/W	34 49	21 55	30 51	56 56	21 50	38 53	25 47	21 48	
5. Sexual behaviour	MPD Rest E/W	2 2	— 2	1 2	4 4	1 1	3 1	1 2	2 2	
6. Obstructing the police	MPD Rest E/W	5 8	4 10	5 13	6 6	8 14	6 12	7 11	6 10	
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	MPD Rest E/W	1 2	* 2	3 4	3 3	1 3	1 3	1 1	1 2	
8. Damage to property	MPD Rest E/W	4 10	2 7	6 13	8 8	6 15	2 12	5 8	4 10	
11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	MPD Rest E/W	20 10	10 11	15 18	12 12	22 13	21 12	20 12	19 11	
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	MPD Rest E/W	2 4	3 3	3 4	3 3	3 5	3 5	4 4	3 4	
Bores (persons with aggravating behaviour)	MPD Rest E/W	2412 14968	301 969	95 206	366 821	(24) 133	478 1691	204 862	1160 3340	5040 22990

* Less than 0.5%

In the rest of England and Wales it is almost as common among beer-only drinkers (26%) as it is among beer and spirit mixers (28%).

Threatening or aggressive behaviour. In the MPD this type of behaviour is commonest among beer and spirit mixers (15%) and drinkers of spirits alone (12%). It is particularly uncommon amongst cider (6%) and wine (4%) drinkers.

In the rest of England and Wales it is also particularly common among spirit drinkers (20%) and beer and spirit mixers (23%), but among consumers of other mixed drinks as well (20%). In contrast with the MPD, threatening and aggressive behaviour is found in comparatively uniform proportions of the drinkers of all types of drink—and is also much more common amongst all types than it is in the MPD.

Public nuisance behaviour. Amongst drinkers of each type of drink who show any aggravating behaviour the proportion making a mere public nuisance of themselves is higher in the MPD (Range:—40 to 51%) than it is in the rest of England and Wales (33 to 44%). There is no consistent tendency for this sort of behaviour to be associated with any one type of drink. In the MPD it is less common amongst those who drink spirits or beer and spirits than it is amongst other groups. Outside the MPD it is least common amongst spirit drinkers and beer drinkers.

Insulting language. In the MPD this is most common amongst wine drinkers (34%) and consumers of mixed drinks other than beer and spirits (38%). It is lowest among beer drinkers (15%).

In the rest of England and Wales insulting language is much more commonly reported generally (48% of all those with any aggravating behaviour) than it is in the MPD (21%).

Insulting language is reported for between 47% and 55% of drinkers of each type of drink outside the MPD.

Obstructing the police is slightly associated with beer and spirit drinking and with drinking spirits only, both in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

Damage to property has similar associations.

Urinating, vomiting in the MPD is associated less with wine and spirit drinking (10% to 15%) than with drinking other drinks (20% to 22%). In the rest of England and Wales it is associated more with spirit (18%) and cider (24%) drinking than with the consumption of any other drink (11–13%).

* * * * *

It must be born in mind that we have no indication of the *quantity* of drink consumed, but only of the type.

The more aggressive types of behaviour tend to be associated with beer and spirit mixers and/or beer only drinkers. But these are predominantly the younger men's drinks, and we should expect the younger generation to be more active than their elders.

Similarly insulting language tends to be associated with wine drinking and drinking of mixed drinks (other than beer with spirits). These tend to be the drinks of older people.

In the present writer's opinion, these data offer no grounds for supposing that any given type of drink, in itself, gives rise to any particular type of behaviour. The discussion above is useful in showing:

1. That in the MPD very similar proportions of arrested drunks are *very* drunk, whatever they have been drinking.
2. That the tendency in the MPD for there to be much less insulting language, and much more "public nuisance" behaviour reported than is the case in the rest of England and Wales shows no sign of bearing any relationship to the type of drink consumed.
3. That, therefore, the characteristic incapability of the Metropolitan drunk is likely to result from the quantity rather than the kind of drink he consumes.
4. That our earlier conclusions about the *relative* incapability of the person charged with drunkenness and disorderly behaviour in the MPD is the outcome of his drinking *more* than persons similarly charged outside the MPD rather than of his drinking different beverages, or mixing his drinks.

Finally, we consider the type of drink consumed in relation to employment status. The information is given in Table 61 for the MPD and for the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 61
Type of drink by employment status at time of incident
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Type of Drink			EMPLOYMENT STATUS								Rates
			Manual	Retired	Unem- ployed	Casual or seasonal	Seasons	H.M. Prison	Other	No inf.	
Beer only	MPD	%	55	2	19	10	1	*	9	4	6537
	Rest E/W	%	64	2	20	5	3	1	3	2	21377
Wine (incl. "white" cider, perry, etc.	MPD	%	20	6	39	15	1	0	10	9	771
	Rest E/W	%	33	4	44	6	4	*	6	3	1705
Cider only	MPD	%	20	4	45	23	*	0	4	5	285
	Rest E/W	%	32	2	44	16	1	1	4	1	376
Spirits only	MPD	%	34	5	21	11	2	*	19	8	1075
	Rest E/W	%	45	3	20	6	9	2	11	3	1670
Methylated spirits only	MPD	%	6	6	60	13	0	0	1	15	304
	Rest E/W	%	10	4	76	5	1	0	1	3	317
Beer and spirits mixed	MPD	%	54	3	12	10	4	1	12	5	1127
	Rest E/W	%	60	1	14	5	10	3	6	1	2632
Other mixed drinks	MPD	%	22	3	38	23	1	0	8	5	543
	Rest E/W	%	37	2	39	9	3	2	4	1	1404
Type of drink not known	MPD	%	34	3	25	13	2	*	7	17	3241
	Rest E/W	%	53	2	22	4	5	2	5	7	5093
Total, all offenders	MPD	%	44	3	23	12	2	*	9	8	13683
	Rest E/W	%	58	2	22	5	4	2	4	3	24580

*Less than 0.5%.

Manual workers currently employed. This group constitute a clear majority of known beer drinkers and of beer and spirit mixers, both in the MPD and in the rest of England and Wales. Manual workers make up between about one-fifth and one-third of the drinkers of each other type of drink (except methylated spirits) in the MPD, and between about one-third and two-fifths in the rest of England and Wales. They make up a smaller proportion of wine-drinking offenders than of offenders who have got drunk on any other beverage (20% of wine drinkers are manual workers in the MPD; 33% in the rest of England and Wales).

Persons unemployed at the time of the incident. Not surprisingly, this group includes the great majority of offenders who have got drunk on methylated spirits. They represent 44 to 45% of cider drinking offenders both in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales. The unemployed also contribute heavily to the total of wine-drinking offenders (39% of whom were unemployed in the MPD and 44% in the rest of England and Wales), and not quite so heavily to offenders who mix their drinks, apart from beer and spirit mixers (38% and 39%).

Casual and seasonal workers have in common with the unemployed that they contribute disproportionately to cider-drinking offenders (23% and 16%) and to offenders who consume mixed drinks, other than beer and spirits.

It is impossible to say whether the trends observed amongst the unemployed indicate principally a wish to drink cheaply, or to get drunk quickly. Cider is a very cheap drink, but rough cider is also quickly intoxicating. Wine is not a cheap drink, but some cheap wines have a reputation for being highly intoxicating. Mixed drinks reputedly make people drunk more quickly, measure for measure, than does either component on its own. It seems probable that the choice of drink by the unemployed is partly determined by their relative poverty (in comparison with employed manual workers) and partly, perhaps, by a more deliberate intention to get drunk.

IV CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT

(i) Time of day of the incident

When recording the time of day at which incidents leading to a charge took place, Police Officers were asked to state the time, correct to the *nearest* quarter-hour, at which an officer first intervened. Incidents recorded as taking place between, for example, 9.0 am and 9.45 am should thus include those at which an officer first intervened within $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes either side of these times—i.e. they cover a total period of one hour. Similarly when the recorded time is, say, between 9.30 pm and 9.45 pm, this actually covers in addition a period of $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes either side of these times—i.e. a total period of half an hour.*

In the Table which follows, and in subsequent comments, we have referred to the "rounded" recorded times, in order to avoid a more cumbersome presentation which would give a false impression of extreme accuracy. The reader should bear in mind that a stated period of time, of whatever duration, in fact includes an additional $\frac{1}{2}$ -hour equally divided between the first and last times stated. The phrase "shortly before till shortly after" indicates this surrounding $\frac{1}{2}$ -hour.

Table 62 shows the times at which an officer first intervened in incidents throughout the day and night in the Inner and Outer MPD, the MPD as a whole, and in the rest of England and Wales.

The same proportion of drunks were apprehended as the result of incidents taking place at the peak hour from shortly before 11 to shortly after 11.45 pm in the MPD as in the rest of England and Wales (nearly one third of all offenders—32.5% and 32.6% in the two areas). The effect of earlier closing hours outside London is reflected in the fact that the majority of these cases fell into the earlier half of the period outside the MPD, but into the later half inside the MPD.

The second peak is the hour between shortly before 10 pm and shortly after 10.45 pm outside London (16.2%), but between shortly before midnight and shortly after 12.45 am in the rest of England and Wales (13.4%).

A substantial majority of all offenders are taken in charge as a result of incidents taking place in the two hours between shortly before 10 pm and shortly after 11.45 pm, though this majority is slightly less in the MPD (57.0%) than it is in the rest of England and Wales (61.7%).

The difference is due to the small, but very consistent, tendency for a greater proportion of all offenders in the MPD to be charged as the result of incidents taking place either in the small hours of the morning (each period from shortly before 1 am to shortly after 4.45 am), or in each later period from shortly before 5 am to shortly after 2.45 pm. Grossed up these periods account for 18.7% of all charges in the MPD, and 11.7% in the rest of England and Wales. The difference is not outstanding, but it is found very consistently at all hours.

*In order to avoid ambiguity, officers were instructed to bring forward to the later $\frac{1}{2}$ hour incidents in which police intervention occurred exactly mid-way between $\frac{1}{2}$ hours. Since an officer about to intervene in an incident is unlikely to know the time of intervention correct to the nearest $\frac{1}{2}$ -minute, this instruction is most unlikely to have affected results.

TABLE 62

Time of day at which an officer first intervened in the incident leading to a charge
Inner and Outer MPD, Total MPD, and the rest of England and Wales.

H

Time span (hrs)	Time of Day (correct to nearest $\frac{1}{2}$ hr)	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of E & W
1	5.00 — 5.45 am	.3	.2	.3	.2
1	6.00 — 6.45 am	.2	.1	.2	.1
1	7.00 — 7.45 am	.1	.3	.2	.1
1	8.00 — 8.45 am	.1	.2	.1	.1
1	9.00 — 9.45 am	.2	.3	.2	.1
1	10.00 — 10.45 am	.4	.8	.5	.3
1	11.00 — 11.45 am	1.1	1.8	1.2	.6
	12.00 (mid-day)				
	— 12.45 pm	1.0	1.4	1.1	.6
1	1.00 — 1.45 pm	1.0	.8	1.0	.6
1	2.00 — 2.45 pm	2.8	1.8	2.5	1.8
1	3.00 — 3.45 pm	4.8	3.6	4.5	4.7
1	4.00 — 4.45 pm	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.7
1	5.00 — 5.45 pm	2.4	1.8	2.2	2.6
1	6.00 — 6.45 pm	1.9	1.6	1.8	2.0
1	7.00 — 7.45 pm	2.5	1.7	2.3	2.4
	8.00 — 8.15 pm	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.7
	8.30 — 8.45 pm	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.3
	9.00 — 9.15 pm	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6
	9.30 — 9.45 pm	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.6
	10.00 — 10.15 pm	4.0	3.4	3.8	5.6
	10.30 — 10.45 pm	7.8	6.8	7.6	10.6
	11.00 — 11.15 pm	14.8	11.7	14.1	18.1
	11.30 — 11.45 pm	18.8	17.1	18.4	14.5
	12.00 (midnight)				
	— 12.15 am	7.1	9.6	7.6	7.8
	12.30 — 12.45 am	5.3	7.7	5.8	5.1
1	1.00 — 1.45 am	6.2	9.7	7.0	4.9
1	2.00 — 2.45 am	2.2	2.4	2.2	1.9
1	3.00 — 3.45 am	1.5	1.3	1.4	0.9
1	4.00 — 4.45 am	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.5
	No information	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.1
Bases		10670	3041	13711	34642

The MPD offender thus tends to be found more frequently at nearly every hour between midnight and afternoon closing-time than does the offender in the rest of England and Wales.

The principal difference between the Outer and Inner MPD is that in the inner area incidents tend to fall off earlier in the night than they do in the outer area. 18.6% of charges in the Inner MPD arise from incidents taking place between shortly before midnight and shortly after 1.45 am, compared with 26% of charges in the Outer MPD. This may, perhaps, indicate that many drinkers in central London live in outer London and so tend to leave the central area while transport is still running.

Afternoon incidents, soon after closing time, account for no more than 4.5 to 4.7% of charges arising from incidents in any one hour either in the MPD or the rest of England and Wales. In the MPD and in the rest of England and Wales the two hours from shortly before 3 pm to shortly after 4.45 pm account jointly for 7.8% and 8.4%, respectively—a surprisingly slight difference

considering the frequently earlier afternoon closing times outside the MPD. But, in general, incidents start to build up a little earlier in the afternoon in the MPD than they do in the rest of England and Wales.

Table 63 is an analysis for seven periods, covering the whole 24 hours, of those offenders in each degree of incapacity who were apprehended at each period:—

TABLE 63
Time of incident related to degree of incapacity
MPD and rest of England and Wales

Periods	Degree of incapacity									
	Total or near-total incapacity		Lesser degree of incapacity		Incoherent		None of these		Total	
	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W	MPD	Rest E/W
5.00 am - 2.45 pm	6.9	6.1	7.9	8.3	6.3	7.6	5.1	2.5	7.1	6.3
3.00 pm - 7.45 pm	14.6	21.0	12.8	15.8	14.5	12.3	15.6	9.8	14.1	15.4
8.00 pm - 9.45 pm	9.4	11.7	9.0	11.3	10.8	9.1	8.5	7.9	9.1	10.2
10.00 pm - 10.45 pm	11.2	14.2	12.1	17.2	10.3	15.9	9.4	17.1	11.4	16.2
11.00 pm - 11.45 pm	10.9	25.2	14.0	32.7	12.4	26.7	36.8	39.4	32.5	32.6
12.00 (midnight) - 12.45 am	13.7	12.7	13.3	11.7	12.0	13.4	14.0	14.5	12.4	12.9
1.00 am - 4.45 am	13.2	8.9	9.7	7.0	10.6	8.8	10.4	8.5	11.4	8.3
No information	0.1	0.1	0.1	*	—	0.1	—	*	0.2	0.1
Bases	6439	10082	6040	12563	679	2939	529	9024	11687	34608

Because being highly incapable might be associated with a lack of work-responsibility, it was considered possible that highly incapable drunks might be found more often in the afternoon and early evening, and less in the evening "peak" hours, than those who were more capable. This hypothesis is not borne out for the MPD, but is borne out for the rest of England and Wales by the data in the above Table. In summary:—

Time		Percentage of all in the degree of incapacity described who were apprehended between the times stated—			
		Total or near-total incapacity	Lesser degree of incapacity	Incoherent	None of these
3 pm- 7.45 pm	MPD	14.6%	13.8%	14.5%	15.6%
	Rest E/W	21.0%	15.8%	12.3%	9.8%
10 pm-12.45 am	MPD	55.8%	59.4%	54.6%	60.2%
	Rest E/W	52.1%	61.6%	66.0%	71.2%

Outside the MPD the proportion of all totally or near-totally incapable offenders apprehended between shortly before 3 pm until shortly after 7.45 pm is 21 %, and ranges downward through each degree of incapacity to only 9.8 % of offenders who are neither incapable nor incoherent. Conversely the proportions apprehended between shortly before 10 pm and shortly after 12.45 am

ranges steadily upwards from 52.1 % of the totally or nearly-totally incapable, to 71.2 % of those who were neither incapable nor incoherent.

No consistent tendency is apparent in the MPD.

(II) Day of the week

As the following Table shows, drunkenness offences in the MPD are not quite so heavily concentrated into the two days, Friday and Saturday, as they are in the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 64
Alleged offences taking place on each day of the week
MPD and the Rest of England and Wales

Day of the Week	Proportion of alleged offences taking place on this day	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Monday	12	10
Tuesday	10	7
Wednesday	9	7
Thursday	12	12
Friday	19	23
Saturday	26	30
Sunday	12	11
	45 %	53 %
Bases	13711	34642

45 % of offences in the MPD occur on Friday and Saturday (Saturday 26 %), compared with 53 % (Saturday 30 %) in the rest of England and Wales. The remaining offences are rather more evenly distributed between the remaining days of the week in the MPD than elsewhere, but the general pattern is the same—with Mondays, Thursdays and Sundays each accounting for 10 to 12 % of offences, Tuesdays and Wednesdays for rather fewer.

The next Table shows the proportions of the totals for each type of behaviour which was reported against alleged offenders in incidents taking place on Friday and Saturday.

In the MPD the proportion of all alleged offenders whose offence took place on Friday or Saturday is 45 %, and the proportion showing no aggravating behaviour is almost identical (44 %). In the rest of England and Wales 53 % of all offences, but only 47 % of those involving no aggravating behaviour, took place on Fridays and Saturdays.

Half or more of the following types of aggravating behaviour by alleged drunkenness offenders occurred on Fridays and Saturdays in the MPD:—physical violence; threatening or aggressive behaviour; obstructing the police and damage to property.*

The preponderance of aggression, violence, threats and damage found among Friday's and Saturday's offenders in the MPD was also found among those in the rest of England and Wales.

*Also sexual behaviour, but it should be noted that this result is based on only 78 cases.



TABLE 65
Behaviour of persons charged
Proportion of each type of behaviour occurring on Fridays and Saturdays
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Behaviour	Proportion occurring on Fridays and Saturdays		Bases	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
13. No aggravating behaviour	44%	47%	8649	11600
1. Physical violence	51	61	711	5634
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	50	57	517	4197
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	46	54	2343	8144
4. Insulting language or behaviour	44	54	1075	10958
5. Sexual behaviour	57	54	78	334
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc)	52	57	293	2392
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	47	44	55	431
8. Damage to property	53	55	221	2322
11. Urinating, vomiting etc.	48	51	971	2470
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	44	59	138	846
Total persons	45%	53%	13711	34597

In the next Table the proportion of all charges which relate to incidents occurring on Friday and Saturday are shown, for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales (several charges are omitted from the Table owing to the very small numbers found in the MPD sample):

TABLE 66
Proportion of all charges of each type which were made against persons involved in incidents taking place on Fridays and Saturdays*

Charge	Proportion which relate to incidents occurring on Friday or Saturday		Bases	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Simple drunkenness	44%	48%	9177	12430
Drunkenness with aggravations	45	54	3744	16891
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	51	57	282	4272
Damage to property	56	54	125	1855
Obstructing the police	55	58	106	1360
Disorderliness	51	59	412	1195
Urinating, vomiting	46	54	54	142
Total persons	45%	53%		

*Charges represented by less than 50 cases in the MPD are not shown in the table, but the total proportions of persons charged as a result of incidents occurring on Fridays and Saturdays are based on the whole sample.

There is no appreciable tendency in the MPD, as there is in the rest of the country, for charges of aggravated drunkenness to be more concentrated into these two days than charges of simple drunkenness. But both in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales over half (51 % and 57 %) of all charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence relate to incidents occurring on Fridays and Saturdays. 56 % and 55 % of the specific charges of damage to property and obstructing the police in the MPD relate to incidents on a Friday or a Saturday, and 58 % and 59 % of the same charges in the rest of England and Wales.

Further analysis shows that in the outer MPD 49 % of all persons charged are charged in relation to incidents taking place on Fridays and Saturdays, compared with 43 % in the inner area.

The types of behaviour which show the heaviest concentration into these two days are: in the Outer MPD—threatening behaviour, public nuisance behaviour and obstructing the police (55 to 56 % of all such behaviour occurring on Fridays and Saturdays); in the Inner MPD—aggressive behaviour and physical violence, threatening behaviour, and obstructing the police (47–51 %).

* * * * *

Analysis of the degree of incapacity of those charged in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales on each day of the week is given in Table 67 overleaf.

Saturday is outstanding, not only because it accounts for so high a proportion of all alleged offenders, but also because a higher proportion of those who are not incapable than of those who are, are apprehended on that day. The difference is not great (In the MPD 25 % of all those in both degrees of incapacity, 28 % of those who are merely incoherent, and 29 % of those showing none of these signs are arrested on Saturdays); but the MPD reflects the trend in the rest of the country (where the corresponding proportions are: 26 %, 29 %, 33 % and 33 %). People who are not incapacitated are better able to take deliberate action, whether of a threatening or aggressive nature.

(iii) Place of Incident

A higher proportion of charges resulted from incidents which began in the street in the MPD (85 %) than was the case in the rest of England and Wales (73 %). This is consistent with the relatively small proportion of incidents in the MPD to which the police were called by managements etc., and the high proportion of persons charged who showed no aggravating behaviour, and were charged only with simple drunkenness. As Table 68 shows, certain charges were much more likely than others to originate in incidents not started in the street.

Table 69 summarises the preceding Table, showing the proportions of each type of charge which resulted from incidents that did *not* take place in the street. The Table lists only those charges of which 50 or more cases occurred in the MPD sample.

It will be seen that the proportion of each type of charge which resulted from incidents *not* starting in the street was smaller in the MPD than it was in the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE 67
Degree of Incapacity by day of the week
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Degree of Incapacity	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Sunday		Basin	
	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales	MPD	Rest of England & Wales
Total and near-total incapacity	11	11	10	8	9	9	11	13	20	22	25	26	13	11	6439	10071
Partial incapacity	11	10	11	8	9	7	12	13	19	23	25	29	11	10	6043	13553
Incoherent	12	9	10	6	10	6	11	13	18	22	28	33	11	11	679	2524
Neither incapable nor incoherent	11	8	8	5	10	6	11	12	30	15	29	33	12	12	529	9007
No information															21	32
Total	12	10	10	7	9	7	12	12	19	23	26	30	13	11	13711	34597

TABLE 68
Charges related to the place where the incident started;
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Place where incident started	Charges	1. Simple drunkenness only	2. Drunkenness with aggravations	3. Drunkenness at same time as another offence	7. Damage to property	12. Obstructing the police	6. Disorderliness	11. Indecent language	4. Assault	8. Theft	5. Possessing offensive weapon	9. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	10, 13, 14. Other charges	TOTAL
Public places	9. Street	MPD 88 Rest E/W 83	82 71	60 53	61 49	74 59	67 47	65 65	39 39	44 44	58 58	90 84	44 40	85 73
	8. Public transport	MPD 4 Rest E/W 4	5 5	7 5	1 4	9 4	6 5	— —	7 7	10 16	2 2	2 2	4 4	4 4
	1. Public house	MPD 2 Rest E/W 3	4 7	17 19	22 21	12 14	13 31	6 7	7 23	16 16	25 25	4 4	11 14	5 4
	2, 3. Dance hall, club	MPD 3 Rest E/W 3	7 3	2 2	1 1	1 8	2 5	7 7	7 7	3 3	6 6	— —	5 5	2 2
	13. Police Station	MPD 3 Rest E/W 3	3 1	5 1	5 1	8 1	5 1	7 1	7 —	3 1	6 —	— —	5 4	2 3
	10, 11, 12. Other public places	MPD 2 Rest E/W 3	1 3	1 3	1 3	1 3	1 2	1 4	— 5	1 9	— 3	— 1	— 4	1 3
	Private places	MPD 3 Rest E/W 3	2 3	3 3	4 2	3 3	2 3	4 2	5 7	9 15	3 3	4 8	4 6	3 7
	4. Offender's home	MPD 3 Rest E/W 3	1 4	2 9	2 6	3 14	3 6	2 6	7 9	1 15	4 3	— 2	1 2	2 1
	5, 6, 7. Other buildings, doorways, gardens	MPD 3 Rest E/W 2	4 7	9 10	6 14	3 8	6 2	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
	14, 15. Other places and no information.	MPD 2 Rest E/W 1	1 1	1 —	2 —	2 —	2 —	1 —	2 —	3 —	— —	2 —	2 —	1 —
Bases (no. of charges)		MPD 9177 Rest E/W 12430	3744 16891	282 4272	125 1855	106 1360	412 1195	316 573	311 337	266 198	68 150	54 142	10 212	14011 39615

†The distributions for charges of which there were less than 50 cases in the MPD sample have not been specified in the Table but are included in the total column.

*Less than 0.5%

TABLE 69

Proportion of charges resulting from incidents
that did not start in the street
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Charge	Proportion of such charges which resulted from incidents that did not start in the street	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Simple drunkenness	12%	17%
Drunkenness with aggravations	18	29
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	40	47
Damage to property	39	51
Obstructing the police	26	41
Disorderliness	33	53
Urinating, vomiting etc.	10	16
Total: All charges, (including those not listed in Table)	15	27

Notes: Charges of which there were less than 50 cases in the MPD sample are not listed in the Table, but are included in the total.

Public Transport. In the MPD 4%, 5% and 7% of each of the three main types of charge, respectively, were the outcome of incidents originating on public transport, and 9% of specific charges of obstructing the police originated from such incidents. In the rest of England and Wales the results were more uniform, with 4 to 5% of each charge (except urinating—nil) originating on public transport.

Public Houses. In the MPD 2%, 4% and 17% of each of the three main types of charge arose from incidents originating in public houses; in the rest of England and Wales 3%, 7% and 19%. Specific charges of damage to property were particularly likely in both areas to arise from incidents started in public houses (22% and 21%). Outside London, but *not* in the MPD an exceptionally high proportion of specific charges of disorderliness (31%) were the outcome of incidents begun in a public house.

Dance halls and clubs.* Incidents originating in dance halls and clubs contributed negligibly to the charges made in the MPD. In the rest of England and Wales they contributed 3% to all charges of aggravated drunkenness, and 5% to charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence (8% to specific charges of obstructing the police).

Other public places. These consist of open land (0.8% in the MPD, 0.5% in the rest of England and Wales), sports grounds (0.1% or less in both areas), and any other public places not already specified (0.9% and 2.1%). 2% and 3% of charges resulted from incidents originating in such places in the two areas. No one type of charge was particularly closely associated with incidents in such places.

*The respective contributions of incidents originating in dance halls to all charges were 0.2% in the MPD and 1.4% in the rest of England and Wales. The corresponding figures for clubs were 0.1% and 0.9%.

Offenders home. Although the overall incidence of charges arising from home incidents in the MPD was slight (under 0.5%), 2% of charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence, and 4% of specific charges of damage to property originated in such incidents. In the rest of England and Wales 2% of all charges, and 3% both of charges of aggravated drunkenness and of drunkenness at the same time as another offence, arose from incidents starting in the offenders home.

Other buildings, doorways and gardens. These include dwelling places other than those at which any offender involved in an incident was living (0.5% in the MPD, 1.4% in the rest of England and Wales); enclosed premises other than those already specified (1.3% and 3.5%) and doorways or gardens, in the case of incidents which did not originate on the premises to which these belonged (1.5% and 1.7%). Miscellaneous public premises are included.

In the MPD 3%, 4% and 9% of charges for each of the three main types of offence, respectively, occurred in such places. For the rest of England and Wales the corresponding figures were 5%, 7% and 10%.

Police Stations. The precise figures for charges arising from incidents in police stations were 0.3% in the MPD and 0.8% in the rest of England and Wales. These include 0.1% and 0.2% of cases in which the offender came in and gave himself up at the Station. It is assumed that the remaining 0.2% and 0.6% were incidents in which either persons who would otherwise have been charged only with simple drunkenness behaved in such a manner at the Station as to merit a more serious charge, or drunken persons came into a Police Station, not to give themselves up, but to create disturbance.

Charges for which the number of cases was too small in the MPD to provide reliable results

Assault. There were only 31 cases of assault in the MPD. But the information from the rest of England and Wales shows that only 39% of such charges arose from incidents originating in the street. 37% arose from incidents in public houses (23%), clubs (7%) or on public transport (7%). Incidents in offenders' homes gave rise to 7% of these charges, compared with a maximum of 4% for any other charge.

Petty theft and minor fraud. Of the small number of such charges (198) found outside London, only 44% took place in the street. Greater proportions of these charges than of any other originated on public transport (10%) and in miscellaneous public (9%) or private (15%) places. 16% originated in public houses. These facts are consistent with the types of behaviour which could lead to such charges amongst drunks—predominantly failure to pay fares, bills, etc.

Indecent language. Outside London 65% of such charges arose from incidents originating in the street. They comparatively rarely arose from incidents originating in public houses (7% only).

(iv) The officers who intervene in incidents which lead to charges

The rank, age, and length of service in any police force of the officer who first intervened in each incident was ascertained.

The following Table shows the proportion of all persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which officers of each rank were the first to intervene.

TABLE 70

The rank of the officer who first intervened
in incidents leading to a charge

H

Rank of officer who first intervened	Proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which this was the rank of the officer who first intervened			
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Constable	% 95.7	% 93.0	% 95.1	% 94.4
Sergeant	3.6	4.3	3.8	5.0
Senior to above	0.5	1.9	0.8	0.5
No information	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.2
Base (persons)	10670	3041	13711	34642

Not surprisingly, the first officer to intervene in the very great majority of cases was a constable (95% in the MPD, and 94% in the rest of England and Wales). Sergeants were the first to intervene in between about 4% and 5% of cases; senior ranks in $\frac{1}{2}$ to 2%. In evaluating the above results it should be borne in mind that about one-fifth of all persons charged in the MPD and about one-third of those charged in the rest of England and Wales were charged as the result of an outside call, and not in the course of the officer's normal duties.

Table 71 shows the proportion of all persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which officers of different ages were the first to intervene.

TABLE 71

The age of the officer who first intervened
in incidents leading to a charge

H

Age of officer who first intervened	Proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which this was the age of the officer who first intervened			
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
19-21 years	38.3	28.4	36.1	20.7
22-24 years	26.6	15.7	24.1	20.9
25-27 years	12.0	15.1	12.7	16.3
28-30 years	10.5	11.3	10.7	13.6
31-40 years	10.0	23.2	13.0	22.6
41-50 years	2.3	5.1	3.0	5.5
51 and over	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.3
No information	—	0.6	0.2	0.1
Base (persons charged)	10670	3041	13711	34642

In the Inner MPD nearly two-thirds (65%) of all charges were the outcome of incidents in which the first officer to intervene was less than 25 years of age. The corresponding figures for the Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales were 44% and 42%.

The intervening officers tended to be particularly young in the Inner MPD, where 38% were between the ages of 19 and 21. This compares with 28% in the Outer MPD and 21% in the rest of England and Wales.

In the Inner MPD only 12% of charges were the outcome of incidents in which the intervening officer was aged over 30, compared with 28-29% in the Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

The next Table shows the proportions of all persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which officers with differing lengths of service (in any police force) were the first to intervene. Officers with less than six months service in any police force were asked to indicate this fact; otherwise length of service was stated correct to the nearest year.*

TABLE 72
The length of service (in any police force) of the officer who first intervened in incidents leading to a charge

Length of Service of officer who first intervened	Proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which the first officer to intervene had this length of service—			
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Under 6 months	11.4	6.7	10.4	4.6
Over 6-12 months	21.1	20.7	21.0	14.7
Over 12-18 months	18.5	12.7	17.2	15.4
Over 18-24 months	11.5	7.6	10.7	11.4
Over 24-30 months	6.9	5.9	6.7	8.4
Over 30-36 months	5.7	4.4	5.4	6.1
Over 36-42 months	3.9	3.3	3.8	5.1
Over 42-48 months	3.1	4.2	3.4	4.3
Over 48-54 months	4.0	6.5	4.5	4.6
Over 54-60 months	2.7	5.5	3.3	3.8
Over 60-66 months	2.4	5.1	3.0	3.5
Over 66-72 months	2.4	3.7	2.7	4.6
Over 72-78 months	1.8	3.9	2.3	3.7
Over 78-84 months	1.3	3.4	1.7	3.5
Over 84-90 months	2.2	3.1	2.4	3.6
Over 90-96 months	0.6	1.6	0.8	1.7
Over 96-102 months	0.4	1.2	0.6	1.0
No information	—	0.6	0.1	—
Base (persons charged)	10670	3041	13711	34642

In the MPD as a whole nearly half of the intervening officers had 2½ years or less of service in any police force, compared with a little over one-third of those in the rest of England and Wales. Officers with very short service were particularly highly represented in the MPD, where one-third of all offenders were apprehended as a result of intervention by officers with under six months (11%) and ½ to 1½ years service (21%).

* * * * *

*No instruction was given on how to record length of service if an incident occurred exactly on completion of a multiple of six months service by the officer. Such cases would be rare, and probably not recognised by the officer concerned. Service recorded as 2 years (to the nearest year) is entered in the Table as "Over 1½-2½ years", etc.

It is not possible to evaluate these results without detailed knowledge of the distribution by age and length of service of those officers who are exposed to drunkenness offences, and the ways in which they are deployed. From the drunkenness offender's point of view they imply that, especially in Inner London, the likelihood of older offenders being faced with officers many years their junior is strong, and that younger offenders are often likely to be faced with officers as young or younger than themselves. Also, many offenders, especially in Inner London, are likely to be faced with officers with rather short service in any Police Force. However, this may well be true for minor offenders in general, and in no way peculiar to the drunkenness offender.

(v) Officers' duties at the time of intervention, how an officer first came to be present, and behaviour related to source of information about the incident

The following Table (73) shows the type of duty in which the first officer to intervene in an incident was engaged at the time.

TABLE 73
Officers' duties at time of incident
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

H

Officers' duties at time of incident	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
	%	%	%	%
Uniform patrol (foot or cycle)	83.4	60.5	78.4	69.8
Uniform patrol (motorised)	11.3	29.0	15.2	22.8
Traffic control	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.9
Plain clothes (not CID)	1.2	2.2	1.5	0.7
C.I.D.	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
Indoor duties	0.7	2.0	1.0	1.5
Supervisory duties (outdoors)	1.9	2.9	2.1	2.4
Off duty	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.7
Other duties	0.6	1.7	0.8	0.6
No information	0.2	1.0	0.3	0.1
Bases (persons)	10670	3041	13711	34642

78% of offenders in the MPD as a whole and 70% in the rest of England and Wales were first approached by an officer on uniform foot (or bicycle) patrol. 15% in the MPD and 23% in the rest of England and Wales were first approached by an officer on a motorised patrol. The remaining 6-7% were first approached by officers on a variety of duties, the largest group being those on outdoor supervisory duties (over 2%).

Although the overall results for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales are not very dissimilar, it will be seen that in the Inner MPD the proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which the first officer to intervene was on a motorised uniform patrol was much smaller (11%) than it was in the Outer MPD (29%) or in the rest of England and Wales (23%).

The next Table (74) shows how an officer came to be at the scene of the incident—whether in the course of his normal duties, or as a result of a call from a member of the public, the management of a public house or other establishment etc:

TABLE 74
How an officer came to be present at the scene
MPD and the rest of England Wales

H

How officer came to be present	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
In course of normal duty	% 85	% 67	% 81	% 66
Called by manager etc. at place of incident	5	10	6	12
Called by member of the public, not personally affected	8	18	10	16
Called by member of the public complaining of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to own property etc.	2	5	3	6
Offender gave himself up at police station	*	*	*	*
Buses (persons)	10670	3041	13711	34642

*Less than 0.5%.

About one in every five offenders in the MPD and about one in every three in the rest of England and Wales were charged as the result of incidents brought to the attention of the police by outsiders. Separate analysis for the Inner and Outer MPD shows that the results for the Outer MPD are closely similar to those for the rest of England and Wales. In the Inner MPD, however, only 15% of offenders were charged as the result of information from outsiders.

The most usual informants were members of the public who were not personally affected (10% of persons charged in the MPD and 16% in the rest of England and Wales were apprehended as a result of such information). Calls from managements etc. accounted for 6% of charges in the MPD and 12% in the rest of England and Wales. Calls by members of the public who were themselves affected personally account for a small minority of charges (3% and 6% in the two areas, respectively).

In evaluating these results it must be borne in mind that the charges resulting from outside calls represent only those calls which brought the police to the scene in time to apprehend the offender. It is reasonable to assume that offenders if they knew that the police were being called, would move away from the scene forthwith, unless they were too drunk to do so. Consequently it is not surprising that the proportion of charges arising from calls by members of the public who were themselves personally affected is small.

* * * * *

The next Table (75) is an analysis of the intervening officer's duties at the time of the incident in relation to how he came to be present.

TABLE 75

Officer's duty at the time of the incident in relation to how the police came to be present
MPD and the rest of England and Wales

C

How Police came to be present at incident			Officer's Duty			Bases
			Uniform patrol (foot or pedal cycle)	Motorised uniform patrol	Other (not uniform patrol)	
In course of normal duties.	Inner MPD	%	87	9	4	9024
	Outer MPD	%	71	22	7	2033
	Total MPD	%	84	11	5	11057
	Rest E/W	%	78	15	7	22164
Called by management etc.	Inner MPD	%	70	21	9	492
	Outer MPD	%	42	44	11	300
	Total MPD	%	59	29	11	792
	Rest E/W	%	55	37	8	4274
Called by public, not personally affected	Inner MPD	%	66	23	11	893
	Outer MPD	%	44	42	14	533
	Total MPD	%	58	30	12	1426
	Rest E/W	%	54	38	8	5376
Called by threatened member(s) of public	Inner MPD	%	45	38	17	240
	Outer MPD	%	26	54	20	153
	Total MPD	%	37	44	19	393
	Rest E/W	%	50	39	11	2217

This Table may be briefly summarised in terms of the use of motorised uniform patrols:

How Police came to be present	Percentage who were charged as a result of incidents in which a motorised uniform patrol on normal duties arrived first on the scene			
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Total MPD	Rest of England and Wales
In course of normal duties	9%	22%	11%	15%
Called by management etc.	21%	44%	29%	37%
Called by members of the public not themselves affected	23%	42%	30%	38%
Called by threatened members of the public	38%	54%	44%	39%

Uniformed motorised patrols accounted for 11% of offenders in the MPD who were found by the police in the course of their normal duties; 15% in the rest of England and Wales.

Officers on motorised patrols in the MPD approached respectively 29%, 30% and 44% of offenders in incidents to which the police were called by managements, and members of the public who were, and were not, affected personally. The corresponding proportions for the rest of England and Wales were 37%, 38% and 39%.

The use of motorised patrols was outstandingly great in the outer MPD. Here 22% of offenders found by the police in the course of their normal duties were found by motorised patrols; 44% of those charged as the result of calls by management, 42% of those charged as a result of calls by members of the public who were not affected; and a clear majority (54%) of those charged as a result of calls by members of the public who were affected, were found by motorised patrols.

* * * * *

Clearly the part played by motorised patrols in investigating the complaints of outside callers about drunks, and apprehending them, is a very substantial one (both in absolute terms and by comparison with their contribution to picking up drunks in the course of normal patrol duties). The contribution of motorised patrols is greatest in apprehending drunks about whom complaints have been made by members of the public who have been personally affected by the drunks behaviour. This is the type of incident in which it is least likely that a call to the police can be made without the knowledge of the alleged offender, and consequently the type in which quick action by the police is most essential.

An increasing use of motorised patrols to investigate such complaints would be likely to lead to an increase in the number of drunks apprehended, even though there might be no change in the number of complaints about drunks received by the police.

Analysis shows that in all the main areas, there was a slight increase during the period of the inquiry in the proportion of offenders who were charged as the result of an incident in which a member of a motorised patrol was the first officer to intervene. In the following Table we compare the first six months and the last six months of the eighteen-month period of the inquiries in the MPD and the rest of England and Wales (i.e. two different periods each including the same months of the year).

TABLE 76
Charges resulting from incidents in which a member of a motorised patrol
was the first officer to intervene

H			Changes over time		
Area			Proportion of offenders charged as the result of an incident in which an officer from a motorised patrol was the first to intervene		
			1st six months	3rd six months	Difference
<i>MPD</i>					
	Inner		10.7%	13.6%	+ 2.9%
	Outer		27.0%	32.2%	+ 5.2%
<i>Rest of England</i>					
	City Forces		22.3%	24.5%	+ 2.2%
	Borough Forces		22.0%	25.2%	+ 3.2%
	County Forces		24.0%	24.7%	+ 0.7%
<i>Wales</i>			5.1%	9.4%	+ 4.3%
BASES	MPD	Inner	3831	3116	
		Outer	1135	978	
		City	5114	5044	
		Borough	2468	2299	
		County	3308	3263	
<i>E. & W.</i>					

If the use of motorised patrols in the apprehension of drunkenness offenders is increasing, as it appears to be, and if, as we have shown, motorised patrols are used particularly often in clearing up incidents reported by the public, managements, etc., it is of particular interest to know what sorts of behaviour give rise to these outside complaints. Table 77 gives this information.

TABLE 77

Behaviour associated with charges arising from incidents at which the police arrived as the result of an outside call

Behaviour	Proportion of cases in which the police arrived on the scene as the result of an outside call						Cases	
	MPD			Rest of England & Wales			MPD	Rest of E and W
	From management	From public	Total	From management	From public	Total		
13. No aggravating behaviour	4%	12%	16%	7%	25%	32%	8649	11600
1. Physical violence	29	22	51	31	19	50	711	5634
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour	17	31	48	21	28	49	517	4197
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	6	12	18	10	17	27	2343	8144
4. Insulting language or behaviour	12	23	35	16	21	37	1073	30958
5. Sexual behaviour	10	40	50	8	39	47	78	334
6. Obstructing the police	14	22	36	19	23	42	295	2362
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	31	26	57	39	27	66	65	431
8. Damage to property	25	34	59	28	33	61	221	2322
9, 10, 11. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	3	11	14	5	19	24	971	2470
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	14	25	39	16	27	43	138	146

The types of behaviour least often found as a result of calls from public or management which lead to a charge were:—

Behaviour	% of charges arising from outside calls	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Urinating and vomiting	14%	24%
No aggravating behaviour	16	32
"Public nuisance"	18	27

In each of these cases members of the public are much more often the source of information than are managements etc.

It may well be that complaints of urinating or vomiting or of "public nuisance" behaviour are made more often than these results suggest, and that the police are unable to reach the scene in time to find the offender. But this is less likely to be the case for those showing "no aggravating behaviour" (who are usually not in a state to make a quick get-away).

The behaviour most frequently associated with charges arising from calls by the public or management were:

Behaviour	% of charges arising from outside calls	
	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
Petty theft and minor fraud	57%	66%
Damage to property	59	61
Physical violence	51	50
Threatening or aggressive behaviour	48	49
Sexual behaviour	50	47

Thus a proportion of the order of 50% or more of charges arising from incidents in which drunks participate in violence or threats against persons, or damage to property, are the outcome of outside calls. It is this type of drunkenness offender who may be expected to be increasingly detected with the growing use of motorised patrols.

* * * * *

Table 78 shows for the MPD and the rest of England and Wales the proportions of persons charged in different ways whose presence became known to the police in the course of their normal duties, and as the result of outside calls from various sources.

Before considering this Table in detail, it should be noted that the marked difference between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales in respect of the first two charges, is very largely attributable to the very high proportions in the Inner MPD of persons charged with simple or aggravated drunkenness only who were found in the course of the officers' normal duties. In the Outer MPD the sources of information are distributed in a way not dissimilar to that found in the rest of England and Wales. Details for the three main charge-groups are shown in Table 79.

In the Inner MPD 86%, 83% and 60% of each of the three main types of charge were the outcome of incidents met with by officers in the course of their normal duties. The corresponding proportions for the Outer MPD were 70%, 67% and 43%; and for the rest of England and Wales 68%, 69% and 50%. The similarity of these results for the Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales is matched by a similarity in the distribution of different outside sources of information.

In evaluating the following comments on the more detailed Table it should be borne in mind that the differences between the MPD and the rest of England and Wales derive largely from the inner area of the MPD.

Simple drunkenness charges. 4% of these charges in the MPD and 6% in the rest of England and Wales were the outcome of calls to the police by managements etc. 13% in the MPD and 26% in the rest of England and Wales originated in calls from the public. These callers were very rarely themselves involved, so assumedly called the police in the interests of the drunk. It would be unwise to infer that the very much smaller proportion of simple drunkenness charges in the MPD which arise from calls by members of the public necessarily reflects any lesser willingness on the part of Londoners to call for assistance on behalf of a drunk in distress. The difference derives from the Inner area, and may be the outcome of different methods of keeping this area under police surveillance.

Drunkenness with aggravations. 7% of charges in the MPD and 13% in the rest of England and Wales originated in calls by managements etc. Since the incidents concerned occurred on enclosed premises, it appears quite probable that this result reflects a lesser inclination on the part of publicans etc. in the MPD to call on the police to deal with refractory customers.

12% of such charges in the MPD and 10% in the rest of England and Wales originate in calls from members of the public. In both cases those reporting the incident were rather more likely to be unaffected by it personally than

TABLE 78

Charges in relation to how police came to be present at scene of incident
MPD and Rest of England and Wales

Charges	How police came to be present—										Bases	
	In course of normal duties		Called by manager etc. at place of incident		Called by member of public not affected by the incident		Called by member of public affected by the incident		Offender gave himself up at police station			
	MPD	Rest of E and W	MPD	Rest of E and W	MPD	Rest of E and W	MPD	Rest of E and W	MPD	Rest of E and W	MPD	Rest of E and W
Simple drunkenness only	83	68	4	6	12	24	1	2	*	*	9177	12430
Drunkenness with aggravations only	80	69	7	13	7	10	5	8	*	*	3744	16891
Drunkenness at same time as another offence	54	50	24	25	10	12	12	13	—	*	282	4272
Damage to property	50	40	28	30	11	14	10	16	—	1	125	1855
Obstructing the police	76	60	13	20	7	10	5	10	—	*	106	1360
Disorderliness	55	44	17	37	15	10	12	9	—	*	412	1195
Indecent language		63		13		11		13		—	(26)	573
Assault		26		28		20		26		—	(31)	337
Thefts		46		29		15		11		—	(26)	198
Possessing offensive weapon		60		19		13		9		—	(8)	150
Unruly, vomiting etc.	87	92	—	3	6	1	7	4	—	—	54	142
Other charges		59		16		12		11		*	(10)	212
Total percentage charged	81	66	6	12	10	16	3	6	*	*	13711	34597

*Less than 0.5%

Note: The distributions are left blank in this Table for charges in the MPD for which there were less than 50 cases in the sample. But distributions given in the total column at the foot of the table includes these charges.

TABLE 79
The three main types of charge in relation to show the police came to be present at scene of incident
Inner and Outer MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Charge	How Police came to be present*												Bases		
	In course of normal duties			Called by manager etc. at place of incident			Called by members of public not affected by incident			Called by member of public affected by incident					
	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest E/W	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest E/W	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest E/W	Inner MPD	Outer MPD	Rest E/W			
Simple drunkenness only	86	70	68	3	8	6	9	20	24	1	2	2	2006	12430	Rest E/W
Drunkenness with aggravations only	83	67	69	6	11	13	6	12	10	4	10	8	647	16891	
Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	60	43	50	22	28	25	10	11	12	9	17	13	176	106	4272
All Charges†	85	67	68	5	10	12	8	18	16	2	5	6	10670	3041	34597

*Table omits from the distributions, but includes in the total, the small number of cases (less than 0.5% in respect of any one charge in any of the three areas) who "gave themselves up" at the police station.

†Including charges under bye-laws etc. against drunks, and charges against intoxicated persons in whose case in the opinion of the police, the actual charge would have given way to a drunkenness charge if the alleged offender had been more drunk.

they were to be affected. It may be inferred that rather more than half of such charges which originated in a call by a member of the public were the outcome of incidents reported in the general interests of orderly behaviour, and not because the caller was personally affected.

Drunkenness at the same time as another offence. In the MPD nearly half (47%) of persons faced with multiple charges which included a drunkenness charge were found as the result of an outside call to the police, and in the rest of England and Wales 50% of such persons were found in this way. Calls from managements etc. were the origin of about a quarter of such cases in both areas, and calls from the public were the origin of another quarter. In this instance members of the public who call the police were rather more often themselves affected than not, but the difference is very small (10% personally unaffected and 12% affected in the MPD; 12% and 13% in the rest of England and Wales).

Among the specific non-drunkenness charges, charges of *damage to property* were particularly likely to originate in incidents reported by managements etc. (28% in the MPD and 30% in the rest of England and Wales).

For charges of *assault* the number of cases in the MPD is too small to give reliable results. But in the rest of England and Wales only 26% of such cases were found by the police in the course of their normal duties. 28% originated in calls from management; 26% in calls from members of the public who were themselves affected; and 20% in calls from members of the public who were not personally affected.

The origin of charges against drunks of *obstructing the police* is of some interest. The majority of such charges arise from incidents met with by police in the course of their normal duties. But 24% of these charges in the MPD and 40% in the rest of England and Wales were the outcome of outside calls—about equally divided between calls from managements and calls from the public. Clearly many alleged offenders found as a result of outside calls are refractory.

* * * * *

It is necessary to emphasise that the total number of outside calls concerning drunks is probably a good deal greater than the number which result in the police finding the alleged offenders. With improved communications and increasing mechanisation the earlier arrival of the police on the scene is likely to result in a higher proportion of all outside calls ending with a charge. Since such calls are predominantly concerned with the more serious type of offender, an increase might ultimately be anticipated in the overall number of multiple offenders (i.e. those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence), as a result of improved police methods.

APPENDIX 1

INCIDENT REPORT
(DRUNKENNESS)

SERIAL No

POLICE FORCE
CODE NUMBER:

NO FORM IS REQUIRED FOR OFFENDERS AGAINST SECTIONS 6 or 11 OF THE ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1980, KICKING OR OTHER CHARGES THAT MAY BE MADE AGAINST THEM. NO FORM IS REQUIRED FOR THOSE CHARGED WITH TAKING A MOTOR VEHICLE INTO A PUBLIC PLACE OR BEING PANI-ED BY A CHARGE OF DRUNKENNESS NOT BROUGHT UNDER THE ROAD TRAFFIC ACT.

NAME OF POLICE STATION:

INCIDENT RESULTING IN ONE OR MORE PERSONS BEING APPREHENDED, OR SUMMONED FOR,

OR

(a) An offence of drunkenness (with or without any other charge).
(b) An offence of being in charge of a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol.

Peace is restored; charged under *By-Laws*, such as Disorderly Behaviour; Committing a Nuisance, etc.)

OR: (ii) The person(s) concerned was likely to have been charged ONLY with an offence of drunkenness, or with one of the

ALTERNATIVE charges described above and not with anything more serious, had he been sufficiently intoxicated to

have been charged.

A. NUMBER OF PERSONS AFFECTED BY: Apprehended DRUNK APPREHENDED OR SUMMONED		D. HOW POLICE CAME TO BE PRESENT AT SCENE OF INCIDENT.		E. CIRCUMSTANCES OF INCIDENT (SEE NOTES BELOW ITEM (a))	
1		1		1	
2		2		2	
3		3		3	
4		4		4	
5		5		5	
6		6		6	
7		7		7	
8		8		8	
9		9		9	
10		10		10	
11		11		11	
12		12		12	
13		13		13	
14		14		14	
15		15		15	
16		16		16	
17		17		17	
18		18		18	
19		19		19	
20		20		20	
21		21		21	
22		22		22	
23		23		23	
24		24		24	
25		25		25	
26		26		26	
27		27		27	
28		28		28	
29		29		29	
30		30		30	
31		31		31	
32		32		32	
33		33		33	
34		34		34	
35		35		35	
36		36		36	
37		37		37	
38		38		38	
39		39		39	
40		40		40	
41		41		41	
42		42		42	
43		43		43	
44		44		44	
45		45		45	
46		46		46	
47		47		47	
48		48		48	
49		49		49	
50		50		50	
51		51		51	
52		52		52	
53		53		53	
54		54		54	
55		55		55	
56		56		56	
57		57		57	
58		58		58	
59		59		59	
60		60		60	
61		61		61	
62		62		62	
63		63		63	
64		64		64	
65		65		65	
66		66		66	
67		67		67	
68		68		68	
69		69		69	
70		70		70	
71		71		71	
72		72		72	
73		73		73	
74		74		74	
75		75		75	
76		76		76	
77		77		77	
78		78		78	
79		79		79	
80		80		80	
81		81		81	
82		82		82	
83		83		83	
84		84		84	
85		85		85	
86		86		86	
87		87		87	
88		88		88	
89		89		89	
90		90		90	
91		91		91	
92		92		92	
93		93		93	
94		94		94	
95		95		95	
96		96		96	
97		97		97	
98		98		98	
99		99		99	
100		100		100	
101		101		101	
102		102		102	
103		103		103	
104		104		104	
105		105		105	
106		106		106	
107		107		107	
108		108		108	
109		109		109	
110		110		110	
111		111		111	
112		112		112	
113		113		113	
114		114		114	
115		115		115	
116		116		116	
117		117		117	
118		118		118	
119		119		119	
120		120		120	
121		121		121	
122		122		122	
123		123		123	
124		124		124	
125		125		125	
126		126		126	
127		127		127	
128		128		128	
129		129		129	
130		130		130	
131		131		131	
132		132		132	
133		133		133	
134		134		134	
135		135		135	
136		136		136	
137		137		137	
138		138		138	
139		139		139	
140		140		140	
141		141		141	
142		142		142	
143		143		143	
144		144		144	
145		145		145	
146		146		146	
147		147		147	
148		148		148	
149		149		149	
150		150		150	
151		151		151	
152		152		152	
153		153		153	
154		154		154	
155		155		155	
156		156		156	
157		157		157	
158		158		158	
159		159		159	
160		160		160	
161		161		161	
162		162		162	
163		163		163	
164		164		164	
165		165		165	
166		166		166	
167		167		167	
168		168		168	
169		169		169	
170		170		170	
171		171		171	
172		172		172	
173		173		173	
174		174		174	
175		175		175	
176		176		176	
177		177		177	
178		178		178	
179		179		179	
180		180		180	
181		181		181	
182		182		182	
183		183		183	
184		184		184	
185		185		185	
186		186		186	
187		187		187	
188		188		188	
189		189		189	
190		190		190	
191		191		191	
192		192		192	
193		193		193	
194		194		194	
195		195		195	
196		196		196	
197		197		197	
198		198		198	
199		199		199	
200		200		200	
201		201		201	
202		202		202	
203		203		203	
204		204		204	
205		205		205	
206		206		206	
207		207		207	
208		208		208	
209		209		209	
210		210		210	
211		211		211	
212		212		212	
213		213		213	
214		214		214	
215		215		215	
216		216		216	
217		217		217	
218		218		218	
219		219		219	
220		220		220	
221		221		221	
222		222		222	
223		223		223	
224		224		224	
225		225		225	
226		226		226	
227		227		227	
228		228		228	
229		229		229	
230		230		230	
231		231		231	
232		232		232	
233		233		233	
234		234		234	
235		235		235	
236		236		236	
237		237		237	
238		238		238	
239		239		239	
240		240		240	
241		241		241	
242		242		242	
243		243		243	
244		244		244	
245		245		245	
246		246		246	
247		247		247	
248		248		248	
249		249		249	
250		250		250	
251		251		251	
252		252		252	
253		253		253	
254		254		254	
255		255		255	
256		256		256	
257		257		257	
258		258		258	
259		259		259	
260		260		260	
261		261		261	
262		262		262	
263		263		263	
264		264		264	
265		265		265	
266		266		266	
267		267		267	
268		268		268	
269		269		269	
270		270		270	
271		271		271	
272		272		272	
273		273		273	
274		274		274	
275		275</			

SEE SEPARATE INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROCEDURE WHEN:

- (i) MORE THAN FOUR PERSONS ARE CHARGED OR SUMMONED AS A RESULT OF THE SAME INCIDENT
(ii) ANY ONE PERSON IS CHARGED WITH TWO OR MORE OFFENCES OTHER THAN OFFENCES OF DRUNKENNESS.

F. DEGREE OF INCAPACITY AT TIME OF INCIDENT OF PERSON(S) CHARGED.

Each column represents one person. Tick the column which best describes each person—the first in the list that applies.

	PERSON			
	1	2	3	4
TOTAL OR NEAR-TOTAL INCAPABILITY. Flat out; unconscious or asleep; unable to remain upright without support.	1			
LESSER DEGREE OF INCAPABILITY. (Tick only if 1 does not apply). Tottering, staggering; supported by friend, supporting self against wall, etc.; at intervals, danger to self or others through lack of balance; etc.	2			
INCOHERENT. (Tick only if neither 1 nor 2 apply). Heavily slurred speech; incoherent but inoffensive remarks addressed to stranger or to no-one in particular.	3			
NONE OF THE ABOVE APPL.	4			

G. BEHAVIOUR LEADING TO CHARGE.

- (i) This and the following apply to both Blocks A and B, each of four columns (1, 2, 3, 4).
— THE BLOCKS DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE TWO TYPES OF CHARGE WHICH MAY ARISE FROM THE INCIDENT
— THE COLUMNS DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUALS CHARGED.
(ii) If only one person is charged with only one offence, then only Column 1 in the appropriate block has to be completed.
(iii) If only one person is charged, but with an offence of drunkenness and another charge, then Column 1 should be completed in both blocks.
(iv) If two or more persons are charged, then Columns 2, 3 and 4 should be used for the second, third and fourth person(s) charged, respectively.
PLEASE PUT A TICK AGAINST ALL DESCRIPTIONS ON THESE TWO PAGES THAT APPLY TO THE BEHAVIOUR OF EACH PERSON CHARGED IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN. TICKS MAY BE MADE AGAINST MORE THAN ONE COLUMN, BUT NOT AGAINST MORE THAN ONE OF THE OFFENCES. DISTINGUISH CAREFULLY BETWEEN THOSE PARTS OF THE OFFENDER'S BEHAVIOUR WHICH LED TO EACH CHARGE, AND CHECK THAT THE SAME BEHAVIOUR IS NOT TICKED MORE THAN ONCE FOR ANY ONE PERSON.
THE DOUBLE LINES ACROSS THE PAGE ARE MERELY FOR VISUAL GUIDANCE IN SEPARATING GROUPS OF SOMEWHAT SIMILAR BEHAVIOUR. MORE THAN ONE ITEM FALLING BETWEEN A PAIR OF DOUBLE LINES MAY BE TICKED, IF APPLICABLE.

"STRANGERS"

PERSON	BLOCK A				BLOCK B			
	Person(s) charged with offence of drunkenness				Person(s) charged with any other offence			
NO AGGRAVATING BEHAVIOUR (i.e. Incapacity or Incoherence ticked in item F above, and this was the sole reason for charge or summons)	1							
VOMITING.	2							
URINATING, defecating (Tick here unless deliberate act of indecent exposure to others is involved)	3							
ROWDINESS OR HORSEPLAY. Shouting; singing; clinking bump-pots; boozily amongst own group, and involving others except through noise, or obstruction incidental to transport.	4							
DELIBERATE OBSTRUCTION OF FOOTWAY (NOT Incapacity) Monopolising pavement; forcing others to use roadway.	5							
DELIBERATE OBSTRUCTION OF TRAFFIC.	6							
PUSHING, JOSTLING, BLUNTING INTO members of the public.	7							
UNSOLICITED REMARKS TO OR CONVERSATIONS WITH STRANGERS; ANNOYING, BUT NON-PESSIMIST IN THEIR CONDUCT.	8							
INSULTING BEHAVIOUR. Addressing insulting, derogatory or mocking remarks to stranger(s). (Over threatening or aggressive; not obscene)	9							
OBSCENE LANGUAGE CONVENED TO CONVERSATION OR SHOUTING AMONGST OWN GROUP.	10							
OBSCENE LANGUAGE DIRECTED TO STRANGERS or, in the case of solitary drinks, to no-one in particular.	11							
OBSCENE, INDECENT, OR OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE DIRECTED AT POLICE.	12							
THREATENING OR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (without actual violence) CONVENED TO OWN GROUP.	13							
THREATENING OR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (without actual violence) TO STRANGERS.	14							
FIGHTING OR PHYSICAL VIOLENCE CONFINED TO OWN GROUP.	15							
FIGHTING, PHYSICAL VIOLENCE, OR ATTACK ON STRANGERS(S)	16							
RESISTING ATTEMPT BY MANAGEMENT TO EFFECT REFUSE ENTRY to pub, club, dance hall or any premises other than private dwelling.	17							
REFUSING OR NEGLECTING TO PAY BILL, FARE, etc.	18							

**Continuation Sheet
(DRUNKENNESS)**

(For use when two or more charges,
other than charges of drunkenness
are brought against the same person)

Serial _____
POLICE FORCE CODE NUMBER

Please copy
from original
form.

G. BEHAVIOUR LEADING TO CHARGE(S).

(i) This and the facing page contain two Blocks (A and B), each of four columns (1, 2, 3, 4)

— THE BLOCKS DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE TWO TYPES OF CHARGE WHICH MAY ARISE FROM THE INCIDENT

(A. Drunkenness; B. Other Offence)

— THE COLUMNS DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUALS CHARGED.

(ii) If only one person is charged with only one offence, then only Column 1 to the appropriate block has to be completed.

(iii) If only one person is charged, but with no offence of drunkenness and another charge, then Column 1 should be completed to both blocks.

(iv) If two or more persons are charged, then Columns 2, 3 and 4 should be used for the second, third and fourth person(s) charged, respectively.

PLEASE PUT A TICK AGAINST ALL DESCRIPTIONS ON THESE TWO PAGES THAT APPLY TO THE BEHAVIOUR OF EACH PERSON CHARGED, IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.
THESE TICKS SHOULD BE MADE AGAINST ALL THE OFFENCES, THE SAME DESCRIPTIONS CANNOT APPLY TO MORE THAN ONE OF THE OFFENCES. DISTINGUISH CAREFULLY BETWEEN THOSE PARTS OF THE OFFENDER'S BEHAVIOUR WHICH LED TO EACH CHARGE, AND CHECK THAT THE SAME BEHAVIOUR IS NOT TICKED MORE THAN ONCE FOR ANY ONE PERSON.

THE DOUBLE LINES ACROSS THE PAGE ARE MERELY FOR VISUAL GUIDANCE IN SEPARATING GROUPS OF SOMEWHAT SIMILAR BEHAVIOUR. MORE THAN ONE ITEM FALLING BETWEEN A PAIR OF DOUBLE LINES MAY BE TICKED, IF APPLICABLE.

"STRANGERS"

INCLUDE AMONGST STRANGERS, EVEN IF KNOWN TO OFFENDER—(i) OFFICIALS (OTHER THAN POLICE) CONTACTING IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY; (ii) MEMBERS OF RIVAL GROUP OR GANG; (iii) PERSONAL ENEMIES.

	ENTER PERSON NUMBER	BLOCK B			
		Person(s) charged with any other offence			
NO AGGRAVATING BEHAVIOUR (i.e. Incapability or drunkenness listed in item F above, and this was the sole reason for charge or summons)	1				
VOMITING.	2				
URINATING, defecating (Tick here unless deliberate act of indecent exposure to others is involved)	3				
ROWDINESS OR HORSEPLAY. Shouting; slugging; climbing lamp-posts; horseplay amongst OWN group, not involving others except through noise, or destruction incidental to horseplay.	4				
DELIBERATE OBSTRUCTION OF FOOTWAY (NOT necessarily Moonpolicing pavement; facing others in road roadway).	5				
DELIBERATE OBSTRUCTION OF TRAFFIC.	6				
PUSHING, JOSTLING, BUMPING INTO members of the public.	7				
UNSOLICITED REMARKS TO OR CONVERSATIONS WITH STRANGERS: ANNOYING, BUT INOFFENSIVE IN THEIR CONTENT.	8				
INSULTING BEHAVIOUR. Addressing insulting, derogatory or mocking remarks to strangers. (Not threatening or aggressive; not obscene)	9				
OBSCENE LANGUAGE CONFINED TO CONVERSATION OR SHOUTING AMONGST OWN GROUP.	10				
OBSCENE LANGUAGE DIRECTED TO STRANGERS or, in the case of solitary drunk(s), to one in particular.	11				
OBSCENE, INDECENT, OR OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE DIRECTED AT POLICE.	12				
THREATENING OR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (without actual violence) CONFINED TO OWN GROUP.	13				
THREATENING OR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (without actual violence) TO STRANGERS.	14				
FIGHTING OR PHYSICAL VIOLENCE CONFINED TO OWN GROUP.	15				
FIGHTING, PHYSICAL VIOLENCE, OR ATTACK ON STRANGER(S)	16				
RESISTING ATTEMPT BY MANAGEMENT TO EFFECT, REFUSE ENTRY to pub, club, dance hall or any premises other than private dwelling.	17				
REFUSING OR NEGLECTING TO PAY BILL, FARE, Etc.	18				

Person(s) charged with any other offence

ANY OTHER BEHAVIOUR NOT LISTED.

PERSON

[illegible]

	BLOCK A Person(s) charged with offence of drunkenness				BLOCK B Person(s) charged with any other offence			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
PERSON								
ACCIDENTAL DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	19							
DELIBERATE DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	20							
THEFT OF "SOUVENIRS": ashtrays, glasses, heacon globes, notices, etc.	21							
SHOPLIFTING, including from street barrows, etc.	22							
POCKETPICKING OR OTHER THEFT FROM PERSON.	23							
OTHER THEFT FROM PUBLIC PLACE. Street, cafe, pub, club, cinema. Not involving breaking with intent or sale intention of stealing.	24							
ATTEMPT TO RESIST ARREST.	25							
ATTEMPT TO "RESCUE" SOMEONE ELSE FROM ARREST.	26							
ATTACK ON POLICE OFFICER, NOT COVERED BY 25 or 26 ABOVE.	27							
ACCOUSING PERSON OF SAME SEX AS OFFENDER.	28							
ACCOUSING PERSON OF OPPOSITE SEX.	29							
INDECENT ACT WITH PERSON OF SAME SEX.	30							
INDECENT ACT WITH PERSON OF OPPOSITE SEX.	31							
INDECENT EXPOSURE (Not merely incidental to items 30 or 31, or to urination).	32							
DRUNK IN CHARGE OF CHILD.	33							
NEGLECT OF CHILDREN: LEAVING CHILDREN UNATTENDED.	34							
BEHAVIOUR NOT LISTED ABOVE	35							
(i) involving stealing	36							
(ii) involving violence to people	37							
(iii) involving damage to property	38							
(iv) involving sex	39							
(v) involving drugs	40							
ANY OTHER BEHAVIOUR NOT LISTED.								

H. CHARGES	PERSON				PERSON			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Simple drunkenness only					18. Breaking or attempted breaking			
2. Drunkenness with aggressions only					19. Shoplifting			
3. Drunkenness at the same time as committing a criminal offence. This section also tick the ONE offence for which details are entered above. IF MORE THAN ONE OFFENCE, USE CONTINUATION SHEET					20. Theft or attempted theft FROM motor vehicle.			
4. Breach of the peace					21. Theft of "souvenirs" (See Item 21 to 19 "G" above)			
5. Indecent assault					22. Other theft, without breaking, from enclosed premises or outdoors.			
6. Assault on police					23. Theft from person.			
7. Assault on spouse or relative					24. Failure to pay fare, bill for a meal, etc.			
8. Other common assault					25. Any charge implying only the offence of common assault (e.g. Intimidating (Committing a Nuisance; Indecent behaviour; Urinating in public place etc.)			
9. Any other wounding or assault charge (including ABH or GBH)					26. Gross indecency or any charge implying gross indecency under item 25 (EXCLUDING indecent assault).			
10. Possessing offensive weapon					27. Indecent or obscene language.			
11. Disorderly or unruly behaviour (or similar offence against bye-law).					28. Obstructing police.			
12. Any other charge relating to fighting or violent conduct, without reference to physical harm to persons					29. Resisting arrest.			
13. Other charge relating to disorderliness					30. Insulting/threatening words / behaviour.			
14. Refusal to quit licensed premises; resisting attempt to eject; attempting to re-enter					31. Importuning, soliciting.			
15. Malicious or wilful damage					32. Buying or consuming intoxicating liquor on licensed premises under age.			
16. Malicious mischief					33. Charge not listed above (Please describe below, giving the person-number of person(s) charged).			
17. Other charge of damage to property.								

PERSONS CHARGED		PERSON			
		1	2	3	4
I. PERSONS CHARGED					
(a) Age (enter figure)				
No information				
(b) Sex					
Male				1
Female				2
(c) Marital Status					
Single				1
Married				2
Widowed, divorced or separated				3
No information				4
(d) Country of Birth					
England				1
Scotland				2
Wales				3
N. Ireland				4
S. Ireland (Eire)				5
West Indies				6
India				7
Pakistan				8
Poland				9
Other country (Tick, and enter name of country on dotted line)				10
No information				11
(e) Place of Residence					
Normally resident outside British Isles				1
Permanent resident in area of this police force				2
Temporary resident in area				3
Resident outside area				4
Vagrant; tramp; no fixed abode				5
No information				6
(f) Employment, etc., AT TIME OF INCIDENT					
Retired and unemployed				1
Unemployed (excludes student)				2
Positive				3
Casual or seasonal work				4
Seaman (includes Merchant Navy)				5
H.M. Forces (includes Navy and Marines)				6
Other regular employment—				7
Manual				8
Other (describe below)				9
No information				9

PERSON		PERSON			
		1	2	3	4
K. CARRYING WEAPONS					
Did the person(s) carry or use any sort of offensive weapon at the time of the incident?					
Carried weapon, did not use it					1
Used weapon					2
Had no weapon					3
No information					4
L. ALCOHOLISM: TYPE OF DRINK CONSUMED					
(a) Is there evidence of treatment under medical supervision for alcoholism, and/or has been treated or prescribed drugs for any serious disorder?					
Has been treated for alcoholism only					1
Has been treated for other nervous disorder only					2
Has been treated for both					3
No evidence					4
(b) Type(s) of alcoholic drink consumed prior to incident.					
Beer (includes stout)					1
Wine (includes "white" wines (e.g. Merlot, Pinot), champagne, port, etc. (e.g. Burgundy), etc.					2
Cider (not "white" type)					3
Spirits or liqueurs					4
Medicinal spirits or surgical spirit					5
Other(s) (describe below)					6
No information					7
M. Was there the offender(s) exhibiting any special occasion, or drinking on account of any special event?					
NOTE.—INFORMATION ON PARTS, etc., NOT HELD ON ACCOUNT OF ANY PARTICULAR OCCASION OR EVENT IS NOT REQUIRED (TICK BOX 1)					
New, or not divulged					1
Sporting event					2
Wedding, birthday, anniversary, funeral or similar domestic event					3
Christmas, New Year or other national festivity					4
Other event (describe below)					5

PERSON		PERSON			
		1	2	3	4
1. NUMBER OF KNOWN PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS OR (SCOTLAND) FORFEITURES OF BAIL.					
Local knowledge					
(a) Five offences of drunkenness					
No information or none known				0
One or more known (enter number known)				
(b) Five other offences					
No information or none known (tick if applicable, Number not required)				1
2					

PERSON		PERSON			
		1	2	3	4
2. NUMBER OF KNOWN PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS OR (SCOTLAND) FORFEITURES OF BAIL.					
Local knowledge					
(a) Five offences of drunkenness					
No information or none known				0
One or more known (enter number known)				
(b) Five other offences					
No information or none known (tick if applicable, Number not required)				1
2					

APPENDIX II

DRUNKENNESS INQUIRY

Instructions on completing "Incident Report" Forms

1. WHEN TO COMPLETE AN "INCIDENT REPORT" FORM

A form should be completed whenever anyone is apprehended or summoned for:

- (a) An offence of simple or aggravated* drunkenness (with or without any other charge).
- (b) Any other offence, IF the offender's conduct was clearly affected by drink AND . . .
 - i A charge commonly or sometimes used as an *alternative* to one of drunkenness is made (i.e. charges under by-laws, such as "Disorderly Behaviour" or "Committing a Nuisance"),
OR
 - ii A charge for some other offence is made, because the offender was not sufficiently drunk to merit a charge of drunkenness, or one of the equivalent charges under a by-law; but who, had he been *more drunk*, would have been charged ONLY with simple or aggravated drunkenness, or an equivalent by-law offence.

Except that no form is required for:

- (a) Any offender charged under Sections 6 or 11 of the Road Traffic Act, 1960 (regardless of any other offences with which he may be charged at the same time).
- (b) A person charged with "Taking and Driving Away", except when he is also charged with an offence of drunkenness not brought under the Road Traffic Act.
- (c) Military personnel banded over to the military authorities after apprehension.

2. INFORMATION REQUIRED ON EACH FORM

Each form relates to a single incident. An "incident" may consist of steering a solitary incapable drunk to the police station; of apprehending several participants in a drunken brawl; of informing one or more persons, not sufficiently drunk to necessitate their being taken in charge, that they will be reported for summons, etc.

A single form allows space for a maximum of four persons charged as a result of one incident; and for a maximum of one charge of drunkenness and one other charge against each person.

The procedure to follow if more than four persons are charged, or more than one charge, other than a charge of drunkenness, is made against an individual, is outlined in paragraphs 5 and 6.

3. WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THE FORM

The *first three pages* of the form should be completed by the *senior officer* present at the incident, as soon as possible after the event. (If two or more

*Note: A full definition of what is meant by "simple" and "aggravated" drunkenness is given in Section 4, paragraph v (c).

officers are present, and the senior officer arrived later than his colleague(s), he will, of course, consult other officers present to complete the picture of what happened before his arrival).

The *back page*, except for Section J (Previous Convictions), can only be filled in after questioning the alleged offender. If a drunk is apprehended and is not in a fit state to answer questions at the time, it should be completed by an appropriate officer later. If a person is summoned, any information which can conveniently be obtained at the time of warning by the officer reporting him for summons should be entered by this officer. Any information not obtained then should be obtained, if possible, shortly before or after his appearance in court.

It is appreciated that it may be impracticable to obtain all the back-page information for persons summoned; and that some persons apprehended may be unwilling to supply all of it. *In these cases please tick the appropriate "No Information" box(es). Do not leave items blank.*

4. HOW TO COMPLETE THE "INCIDENT" FORM

- i A tick (or, where stated, a number or series of numbers) should be entered in the appropriate box or boxes for each item of information required.
- ii Information in words is required only where specifically requested on the form, or when none of the cross-heads alongside the boxes are applicable.
- iii A box headed "No information" is provided for all items on which information may, occasionally, not be available. *Please do not omit to tick this box when applicable. We shall not otherwise know whether a piece of information has been accidentally omitted, or has not been obtained.*
- iv *Cover Page*
 - (a) Enter at the head of the form the name of the police station at which the offender was charged or reported for summons.
 - (b) *Numerical Entries.* Instructions for making numerical entries are given on the form. Please make all numerical entries in figures, not in words. Do NOT use roman numerals in the date.
 - (c) *Non-Numerical Entries.* Make a tick in the appropriate box for each item of information. There should be one tick only for each item.
 - (d) *Item A (Number of Persons affected by Drink who are Apprehended or Summoned as the result of Incident).* Note that two entries are required here: one to indicate the number of persons apprehended and one to indicate the number summoned. *If either of these categories does not apply then a nought must be placed in the appropriate box.*
 - (e) *Item C (Details of Officer who first intervened).* Note that the details required here relate to the officer first intervening in the incident. *If two or more officers become involved in the incident, this may not be the officer completing the form.*
- v *Inside Pages*
 - (a) *Item F (Degree of Incapacity).* Each column represents one person. Regardless of the charge(s) against him, make one tick to indicate the degree of incapacity of each person charged.
 - (b) *Item G (Behaviour leading to Charges).* Keep to the same person-number as used in *Item F*.

1. IN BLOCK A, for each person charged with an offence of drunkenness tick each of the descriptions of behaviour which apply in his case, *in relation to the drunkenness charge*. Do not tick in Block A any behaviour relating to another charge.
2. IN BLOCK B, for each person charged with an offence other than one of drunkenness (whether or not he was charged with an offence of drunkenness as well), tick each of the descriptions of behaviour *relating to the first such offence*.

If any person is charged with more than one offence other than an offence of drunkenness, use Continuation Sheets for the second and subsequent other offences. (See paragraph 5).

N.B. We wish to emphasise that Items F and G should be so completed as to give the fullest possible description of the offender's behaviour at the time of the incident, regardless of whether any particular aspect of his behaviour appears relevant to any charge subsequently made against him. Ticks relating to such behaviour should be entered in Block A (Behaviour leading to Drunkenness Charge).

(c) Item H (Charges)

1. BOX 1 (*Simple Drunkenness*) ONLY should be ticked when the offender is charged ONLY with being found drunk in a public place or of being drunk and incapable.
2. BOX 2 (*Drunkenness with Aggravations*) ONLY should be ticked when the offender is charged with ONE OFFENCE ONLY and the charge includes in its description a reference to drunkenness combined with some kind of "aggravating" behaviour. Common examples of such offences being—
 - i "Being guilty while drunk of riotous or disorderly behaviour in a highway or other public place . . ."
(Section 12 of the Licensing Act, 1872).
 - ii "Refusing or failing when drunk to quit licensed premises when requested"
(Section 18 of the Licensing Act, 1872).
3. BOX 3 (*Drunkenness at the same time as another offence*) should be ticked ONLY when two or more charges are brought against the offender: one of which is for an offence of "simple" or "aggravated" drunkenness.
The nature of the *non-drunkenness* offence (the behaviour leading to which will have been described in Block B of Item G), should be indicated by a tick in one of the boxes below (numbered 4-33).
If there is more than one other charge a *Continuation Sheet* must be used.
4. *If there is no charge of drunkenness*, tick one of the boxes, numbered 4 to 33, only, to indicate the nature of the non-drunkenness offence. If there are two or more charges of this kind, a *Continuation Sheet* must be used.

vi Back Page

- (a) Notes on completion of the back page, which entails questioning the person(s) charged, have already been given in paragraph 3.

Forms may be retained and included in the subsequent period's returns, if by so doing additional information for the back page may be obtained (i.e., principally when a person has been summoned during the first period, but the case has not been heard—so that there has been little or no opportunity to speak to him).

- (b) *Item I (f) (Employment)*. A person is unemployed if:
- i He is entitled to unemployment benefit, but not sickness benefit, at the time of the incident.

OR ii He is sick, entitled to unemployment benefit, has no job awaiting him when he recovers, but will then seek one.

OR iii He has lost a job within 0 to 3 days of the incident, and has not yet found, or has not yet started work on, another job.

Manual Worker Industrial and other manual workers, excluding all clerical workers and higher grades. *If in doubt* as to whether a person should be classified as a "manual worker" or not, tick "Other" (Box 8) and describe the person's job.

- (c) *Item L (b) (Types of drink consumed)*. Ports, sherries and other fortified wines should be ticked "Other" (6) and described.

5. PROCEDURE WHEN A PERSON IS CHARGED WITH TWO OR MORE OFFENCES, OTHER THAN OFFENCES OF DRUNKENNESS

If a person is charged with two or more offences other than offences of drunkenness (regardless of whether they are also charged with an offence of drunkenness), use a *Continuation Sheet* or sheets. Proceed as follows:

- (a) Copy the *serial number* and the *police force code number* from the original form, and enter at head of *Continuation Sheet*.
- (b) Enter the appropriate person-number(s) in the blank boxes at the top of Block B—one column for each additional charge. Thus, if Person No. 1 is charged with two additional offences apart from those entered on the main form, and Person No. 2 with one additional offence, there will be two columns on a *Continuation Sheet* for Person No. 1, and one column for Person No. 2.
- (c) Complete Sections G and H for each column, and pin the *Continuation Sheet* to the original form.

6. IF MORE THAN FOUR PERSONS ARE CHARGED AS A RESULT OF THE SAME INCIDENT

- (a) Complete a form for four of the persons charged.
- (b) Take another form. Delete the serial number, and substitute the serial number of the first form.
- (c) Cross through page 1 of the new form.
- (d) Delete person-numbers at head of Section F, and substitute 5, 6, 7, 8, as required, for subsequent offenders after the fourth. *No further alteration need be made. In subsequent items we shall assume that entries under "Person No. 1" refer to Person No. 5, etc.*

- (e) Complete the entries for pages 2, 3 and 4.
- (f) Pin the second form to the original one.
(Further additional forms should be used if more than 8 persons are charged as a result of one incident).

CHARGES. In Section H the list of charges is not intended necessarily to embody the wording of the charge. If the action with which a person is charged is described in the list, it should be ticked regardless of how the charge is actually worded.

Any queries regarding these instructions, or any difficulties met with in completing the forms, should be referred to: H. D. Willcock, Social Survey, Central Office of Information, Atlantic House, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.1.

APPENDIX III

Police Forces in England and Wales, and Sub-Divisions of the Metropolitan Police Force included in the samples

ENGLAND AND WALES

Cities

Bradford
Cardiff
Exeter
Leicester
Liverpool
Manchester
Norwich
Oxford
Salford
Sheffield
Stoke-on-Trent
Wakefield
York

Other County Borough Forces

Barnsley
Blackpool
Brighton
Burnley
Derby
Doncaster
Dudley
Gateshead
Grimsby
Halifax
Huddersfield
Middlesbrough
Newport
Oldham
Preston
Rochdale
St. Helen's
Southampton
Southend-on-Sea
Southport
Stockport
Tynemouth
Wallasey

County Forces

Berkshire
Buckinghamshire
Cambridgeshire
Carmarthenshire and
Cardiganshire
Cheshire
Cornwall

County Forces cont.

Cumherland and
Westmorland
Flintshire
Gloucestershire
Gwynedd
Hertfordshire
Kent
Lancashire
Lincolnshire
Northamptonshire
Nottinghamshire
Oxfordshire
Peterborough (Combined)
Somerset
Staffordshire
Sussex (East)
Wiltshire
Worcestershire
Yorkshire (East Riding)
Yorkshire (North Riding)

METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT

Inner Stratum

Bow
Bow Street
Cannon Row (Whitehall)
Carter Street
Commercial Street
Fulham
Holloway
Kennington Road
Kensington
West End Central (2)

Outer Stratum

Acton
Balham
Barnet
Bexleyheath
Bromley
Croydon
East Ham
Enfield
Hackney
Harlesden
Kingston

APPENDIX IVa

Full descriptions of Behaviour appearing on Form, and subsequent grouping

Group 1. Physical violence

Fighting or physical violence confined to own group

Fighting, physical violence, or attack on stranger(s)

Resisting attempt by management to eject, refuse entry to, pub, club, dance hall or any premises other than private dwelling

Other behaviour involving violence to people (other than attacks on police officers)

Group 2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence)

Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without actual violence) confined to own group

Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without actual violence) to stranger(s)

Group 3. General "public nuisance" behaviour

Rowdiness or horseplay. Shouting; singing; climbing lamp-posts; horseplay amongst OWN group, not involving others except through noise, or obstruction *incidental* to horseplay

Deliberate obstruction of footway (NOT incapable), monopolising pavement; forcing others to use roadway

Deliberate obstruction of traffic

Pushing, jostling, bumping into members of the public

Group 4. Insulting language or behaviour

Unsolicited remarks to, or conversations with, strangers; annoying but inoffensive in their content

Insulting behaviour. Addressing insulting, derogatory or mocking remarks to strangers (*Not* threatening or aggressive; *not* obscene)

Obscene language confined to conversation or shouting amongst own group.

Obscene language directed to strangers, or, in the case of solitary drunks, to no-one in particular

Obscene, indecent, or offensive language directed at police

Group 5. Sexual behaviour

Accosting person of same sex as offender

Accosting person of opposite sex

Indecent act with person of same sex

Indecent act with person of opposite sex

Indecent exposure (not merely incidental to the two items above, or to urination)

Other behaviour involving sex

Group 6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)

Attempt to resist arrest

Attempt to "rescue" someone else from arrest

Other attack on police officer, not covered above

Group 7. Petty theft and minor fraud

Refusing or neglecting to pay bill, fare etc.

Theft of "souvenirs"; ashtrays; glasses; beacon globes; notices etc.

Shoplifting, including from street barrows etc.

Pocket-picking or other theft from person

Other theft from public place, street, cafe, pub, club, cinema. *Not* involving breaking or entering with main or sole purpose of stealing

Other behaviour involving stealing

Group 8. Damage to property

Accidental damage to property

Deliberate damage to property

Other behaviour involving damage to property

Group 9. Neglecting children

Drunk in charge of a child

Neglect of children; leaving children unattended

Group 10. Behaviour involving drugs

Group 11. Urinating and vomiting

Urinating, defecating (unless deliberate act of indecent exposure to others is involved)

Vomiting

Group 12. Any other behaviour not listed

Group 13. No aggravating behaviour

APPENDIX IVb

Full description of Charges appearing on Form, and subsequent groupings

Note: Groups 1-3 are additive, and include all offences of drunkenness in England and Wales.

Subsequent groups include—

- (a) Additional charges made at the same time as a charge of drunkenness (i.e. the non-drunkenness charges already included in Group 3)
 - and (b) Charges sometimes used as *alternatives* to charges of drunkenness (e.g. charges under bye-laws)
 - and (c) Charges, other than charges of drunkenness, which, in the opinion of the arresting officer, would have given way to a drunkenness charge *only* (i.e. a charge in Group 1 or Group 2), had the person charged been *more* drunk than he was.
-

Group 1. Simple drunkenness only

Group 2. Drunkenness with aggravations only

Group 3. Drunkenness at the same time as another offence

Group 4. Assaults (not against the police, and not indecent)

Assault on spouse or relative

Other common assault

Any other wounding or assault charge

Group 5. Possessing offensive weapon

Group 6. Disorderly or unruly behaviour

Breach of the pence

Disorderly or unruly behaviour (or similar offence against bye-law)

Any other charge relating to fighting or violent conduct, without reference to physical harm to persons

Other charge relating to disorderliness.

Refusal to quit licenced premises; resisting attempt to reject; attempting to re-enter

Group 7. Damage

Malicious or wilful damage

Malicious mischief

Other charges of damage to property

Group 8. Petty theft or fraud

Breaking or attempted breaking

Shoplifting

Theft or attempted theft FROM motor vehicle

Theft of "souvenirs"

Other theft, without breaking, from enclosed premises or outdoors

Theft from person

Failure to pay fare, bill for meal, etc.

Group 9. Any charge implying ONLY the offence of urinating, vomiting or defecating

Committing a nuisance; indecent behaviour; urinating in a public place, etc.

Group 10. Indecency

Indecent assault

Gross indecency or any charge implying an indecent act (other than charges in Group 9)

Group 11. Insulting behaviour (including soliciting)

Indecent or obscene language

Insulting/threatening words/behaviour

Importuning; soliciting

Group 12. Obstructing or assaulting the police

Assault on police

Obstructing police

Resisting arrest

Group 13. Buying or consuming intoxicating liquor in licensed premises under age

Group 14. Other charges

APPENDIX V

TABLE 12(A)
Behaviour (detail)

Note: This Table is based on the whole of the samples from each area, including those who showed no aggravating behaviour.

Table 12, in the text, compares the nature of aggravating behaviour in each area, omitting those with no aggravating behaviour from the bases.

H

Behaviour	MPD	Rest of England and Wales
No aggravating behaviour	% 63.1	% 33.5
Physical Violence		
Fighting or physical violence amongst own group	2.3	7.4
Fighting, physical violence, attacks on strangers	1.1	4.1
Resisting attempt by management to eject or refuse entry	1.9	5.8
Other behaviour involving violence to people	0.2	0.3
Threatening or Aggressive Behaviour without violence		
Threatening or aggressive behaviour confined to own group	1.4	4.6
Threatening or aggressive behaviour towards strangers	2.4	7.7
General "Public Nuisance" Behaviour		
Rowdiness or horseplay	13.4	17.2
Deliberate obstruction of footway	0.7	2.1
Deliberate obstruction of traffic	1.0	1.8
Pushing, jostling or bumping the public	2.8	5.7
Insulting language or behaviour		
Unsolicited remarks to strangers	1.4	1.7
Insulting behaviour	1.8	3.6
Insulting language amongst own group	1.3	6.2
Insulting language directed at strangers	2.9	9.6
Insulting language directed at police	2.3	17.8
Sexual Behaviour		
Accosting person of same sex as offender	0.2	0.4
Accosting person of opposite sex	0.4	0.6
Other sexual behaviour	—	0.1
Obstructing the Police (excluding verbal insult etc.)		
Attempt to resist arrest	1.6	3.4
Attempt to rescue someone else from arrest	0.3	1.2
Attack on police officer	0.5	2.7
Petty Theft and Minor Fraud		
Refusing or neglecting to pay bill or fare	0.4	0.7
Other behaviour involving stealing	0.1	0.5
Damage to Property		
Accidental damage to property	0.4	0.6
Deliberate damage to property	1.3	5.9
Other behaviour involving damage to property	0.1	0.2
Child Neglect		
Neglect of children, leaving children unattended, drunk in charge of a child	0.1	0.2
Drugs		
Behaviour involving drugs	—	*
Vomiting and Urinating, etc.		
Vomiting	1.5	2.4
Urinating, defecating	5.6	5.1
Any Other Behaviour not listed		
Other behaviour	0.9	2.2
BASES (Total number of persons in sample)	13711	34642

*Less than 0.5%.

APPENDIX VI

The Offences of Drunkenness covered by this Inquiry

1. Offences not included

It is an offence under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Act 1960 to drive or attempt to drive a motor vehicle on a road or other public place when unfit through drink; or to be in charge of a motor vehicle which is on a road or other public place, but not driving the vehicle. Under Section 11 of the same Act it is an offence to ride a cycle or tricycle when under the influence of drink. *Offences under the Road Traffic Acts are excluded from this inquiry.*

2. Simple Drunkenness

This is the offence of being found drunk in any highway or other public place, or on any licensed premises (Licensing Act, 1872, Section 12, first paragraph). The expression "public place" includes any place to which the public have access (Licensing Act, 1902, Section 8).

The Licensing Act 1902 (Part 1, Section 1) states:

"If a person is found drunk in any highway or other public place, whether a building or not, or on any licensed premises, and appears to be incapable of taking care of himself, he may be apprehended and dealt with according to law".

With relatively few exceptions persons charged with an offence of simple drunkenness have not (while observed by the police) behaved in any way possibly offensive to members of the public, other than by manifesting their incapability. The most common exceptions are urinating or vomiting.

3. Aggravated Drunkenness

The offences of drunkenness with aggravation consist of: (i) all offences, except simple drunkenness, specified in the First Schedule to the Inebriates Act 1898* (which is a consolidation of earlier statutes); (ii) offences under Section 2 of the Licensing Act, 1902, and (iii) offences under Section 174 of the Licensing Act, 1964.

(ii) above, makes it an offence to be found drunk . . . while having the charge of a child apparently under the age of seven years (being drunk in charge of a horse or cattle had long been an offence before this).

(iii) above extends the provisions of the Inebriates Act, 1896, (refusing or failing when drunk to quit licensed premises when requested) by giving power to the holder of a justices' licence to refuse to admit to, or to expel from, the licensed premises any person who is drunken, violent, quarrelsome or disorderly.

The various offences specified in the First Schedule to the Inebriates Act have one thing in common. With the exception of "being drunk while in possession of any loaded firearms", they concern offences by drunken people which occur in public places, or places to which the public have access.

*The offence of being drunk while in charge of any "carriage", is, however, now an offence under the Road Traffic Act, and not under the Inebriates Act, so far as motor vehicles, bicycles and tricycles are concerned.

Although certain non-drunkenness offences may be committed in a public place while drunk, the results of the present inquiry *must not be taken as in any way indicative of the association between drinking and crime*. Offences of drunkenness are essentially offences committed while *drunk*, and the internal evidence indicates, as might be expected, that there is rarely evidence of skill or forethought in the actions which lead to such charges. A very different picture might be expected to emerge if all offences were considered, and the proportion of offenders of different kinds who *had been drinking* shortly before their offences were calculated.

4. Similarities between the behaviour of persons who are, and who are not, drunk

Simple drunkenness offenders manifest directly the sign of intoxication, but usually do no more.

Offenders charged with aggravated drunkenness commit some act which, if they were not drunk at all, would be a breach of the law. Many of these acts are, in fact, relatively common among people who have not been drinking.

It follows that changes in the incidence of charges of *aggravated* drunkenness are not necessarily the outcome of changes in drinking habits and/or of police practice or efficiency. They may result from changes in the nature of public behaviour of people in general, or of certain sections of the population. For example, if it were to become an increasingly frequent occurrence for young people to behave in a disorderly manner in the street, such a change in behaviour might affect drinkers and non-drinkers alike. No change in drinking habits or police practice would then be implied by an increase over time in the number of young people charged with being drunk and disorderly, but a corresponding increase would be expected in the numbers charged with the equivalent non-drunkenness offences.

In the context, and within the limitations, of this report, it should perhaps be borne in mind that some, at least, of those charged with aggravated drunkenness *might* have been behaving in a very similar manner at the time of the incident had they not been drinking alcoholic drinks at all.



Part II

The Drunkenness Offender in Scotland



INDEX AND NOTES ON INTERPRETATION	Page A-C
SUMMARY	155
I BACKGROUND	
i The basis for comparison	173
ii The sample	174
iii Notes on the Scottish Tables	176
iv Comparison of the distribution of the main types of charges reported in Scotland, the MPD and the rest of England and Wales	177
II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR	
i Introduction	179
ii Degree of incapacity	180
iii The Nature of aggravating behaviour (detail)	182
iv Behaviour (main types) and capability	185
v Behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace only (Sc.) or of aggravated drunkenness only E/W(X)	188
vi Aggravating behaviour among those charged with simple drunkenness only	191
vii Behaviour associated with charges other than those of breach of the peace or drunkenness	191
viii Proportions of each type of behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace or drunkenness only	195
ix Charges made against drunks other than charges of drunkenness or breach of the peace	198
III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKEN OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES	
i Sex	201
ii Age	204
iii Age, sex, and charge	208
iv Marital status	210
v Residential status	210
Residential status and charges	211
vi Country of birth	211

	<i>Page</i>
III—Continued	
vii Employment status	214
viii Number of persons involved	216
ix Physical injury and personal material loss	218
x Carrying and using weapons	221
xi Previous convictions known to the police	222
xii Celebrations	225
xiii Type of drink consumed	225
xiv Medical treatment known to the police	236
 IV THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT	
i Time of day	237
ii Day of the week	242
iii Place of incident	246
iv The officers who intervened in incidents leading to a charge	249
v Officers duties at the time of intervention; how an officer came to be present; and behaviour related to the source of information about the incident	251
 APPENDIX I The form completed by the Police.	 257
 APPENDIX II Instructions on completing "Incident Report" forms.	 261

NOTES ON INTERPRETATION

1. **Multicoding.** In numerous Tables the bases quoted are the number of persons concerned, and the percentages are the proportions of these people behaving in certain ways. Since one person may be recorded as showing several kinds of behaviour, the sum of the percentages is usually much in excess of 100%.

This will be obvious to the reader in such Tables as S10, S12, S13, S15, etc., which refer to the general behaviour of the persons charged. In a few instances it may not be immediately obvious. For example, cross-addition of columns in Table S35 (*"Charges in relation to persons suffering physical injury or personal loss"*) give totals ranging upwards to 115%. This is because one offender may cause injury etc. to more than one type of person in a single incident. For example, in a case of assault, the police may be assaulted in the course of dealing with an assault on someone else.

2. **Sum of percentages.** Percentages have usually been quoted correct to the nearest 1%. In most cases this gives a total of 100%, but totals range between 99% and 101% (and on very rare occasions 97% and 103%).

3. **Behaviour (double counting).** In Tables relating to general behaviour (shortened version) which includes the item (third in the list) *"Breach of the peace etc. at the same time as another offence"*, this item includes all other specific charges listed later in the Table, but these later items also include instances of the specified charges in which *only* the offence specified was charged (without any breach of the peace or drunkenness charge). Thus the total of persons charged bears no direct relationship to the sum of the bases for each single item.

4. **Absolute incidence: no comparison between areas is possible.** Part II indicates, within each of the two areas severally, the *relative* frequency with which various forms of behaviour and other characteristics of offenders were found *within that area*.

It is most important that the reader should bear in mind that cross-comparisons can NOT be made between areas of the *absolute* numerical incidence of any given form of behaviour etc.

We can say, for example, (see Table S6), that arrested drunks in Scotland who show aggravating behaviour are more likely than those arrested in E/W(X) to have used physical violence. We cannot say, in terms of absolute numbers, whether or not there are more violent arrested drunks in Scotland than in E/W(X).

This rather elementary observation is made partly because numerous statements in the text might unwittingly lead the reader to think in terms of absolute numbers, and because, completely fortuitously, the sizes of the two samples of drunks showing aggravating behaviour are closely similar in the two areas, respectively, which could give a false impression of cross-comparability.



SUMMARY

1. BACKGROUND AND APPROACH

1. **The Enquiry.** An enquiry as exactly comparable as possible was made in Scotland during the same period as that made in the rest of Great Britain.* Similar sampling methods were used, and half of the Police Forces in Scotland participated. The sample consisted of rather over 36,000 cases.

2. **Differences in Charging Practice.** Charges of aggravated drunkenness ("drunk and disorderly" etc.) are rarely made in Scotland. This is a matter of prosecution discretion, not of any difference in law. The charge most commonly used in Scotland in cases where aggravated drunkenness would be used in England and Wales is one of breach of the peace.

This difference in practice made it necessary, in order to ensure that similar cases would be included in all areas, to issue slightly different instructions to the police in Scotland from those issued in England and Wales.

3. It is unlikely that the differing instructions have affected the criteria used in deciding which cases to include, except for the admission in Scotland of a fairly small number of offences by drunks committed in private dwellings. (Nearly all charges of drunkenness are applicable only to offences committed in public places).

4. **Exclusion of the MPD from comparisons made in this part of the Report.** In the first part of this report we have noted many very substantial differences between the results obtained from the Metropolitan Police District and the rest of England and Wales. In particular 67% of all charges in the MPD were for simple drunkenness only, compared with only 36% in the rest of England and Wales. Multiple charges against drunks (ie charges of drunkenness at the same time as another offence) were much less common in the MPD (2%) than they were in the rest of England and Wales (12%). (*Table S1*)

5. In Scotland the proportion of all offenders who were charged only with simple drunkenness differed marginally from that found in England and Wales, and in general the overall results bore a much closer resemblance to those found in the rest of England and Wales than in the MPD. Since the differences between the two latter areas have already been described in detail, it was felt appropriate to confine this part of the report to a comparison between Scotland, and England/Wales outside the MPD. (*Table S1*)

Henceforth, England and Wales outside the MPD will be referred to in the abbreviated form "E/W(X)"

6. **The formulation of charges against drunks in the two areas.** Although a charge of breach of the peace is the one most commonly used in Scotland against

*It will be recalled that boundary changes in the Metropolitan Police District, coinciding with the formation of the Greater London Council, delayed the starting date in the MPD by six months. In Scotland, and in England and Wales outside the MPD, the period covered was November 1964 till April 1966 inclusive.

a person who would be charged with an offence of aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X), this is only one indication of the effects in Scotland of formulating the charge in accordance with the drunk's behaviour rather than his drunken state. The simple drunk ("drunk and incapable") matches closely with his counterpart in E/W(X). But 16.8% of all charges in Scotland, compared with only 3.4% in E/W(X) were made against intoxicated persons who were charged neither with an offence of drunkenness nor with one of breach of the peace. (Table S1)

7. This difference makes the evaluation of certain apparent differences between the two areas difficult: it is sometimes impossible to tell whether they are indicative of true behavioural differences or of differences in the formulation of charges.

II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR

8. Degrees of Incapacity. Closely similar proportions of those charged in Scotland and in E/W(X) were rated by the police as totally or nearly totally incapable.

But fewer in Scotland than in E/W(X) were rated as partially incapable, and many more (Sc. 40%; E/W(X) 26%) as neither incapable nor incoherent. (Table S2)

9. The majority of drunks charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland (63%) were rated as neither incapable nor incoherent, compared with only 38% of those charged with simple drunkenness in E/W(X). Similar, though rather less marked, differences were found between the two areas in respect of those charged with multiple offences which included either drunkenness or breach of the peace, and those charged only with another offence or offences. (Tables S3 and S4)

10. The explanation of these marked differences is not clear. It is suggested that they may be the outcome of a greater tolerance in Scotland of the relatively "obviously", and hence relative innocuously, drunk. This suggestion appears to be supported by the data presented immediately below. (It is important to notice that the difference does not extend to the most highly incapable, who may need to be taken in custody for their own protection).

11. The Nature of Aggravating behaviour. The outstanding difference in the behaviour reported from the two areas lies in the much smaller reported incidence of "general public nuisance" behaviour in Scotland (7.5%) than in E/W(X) (34.8%). (Tables S5 and S6)

This is the most innocuous form of behaviour described. It offers no threat or insult to others, or to those within the drunken group, and consists mainly of simple rowdiness.

12. Unless drunks in Scotland are indeed much less prone to this type of behaviour than are those in E/W(X), this result appears to indicate a lesser susceptibility of the public in Scotland to noisy innocuous behaviour by drunks, which is reflected in a lesser likelihood of the police bringing charges against those who behave merely in these over-exuberant ways.

13. Most other behavioural differences were minor ones. Among those showing any aggravating behaviour the incidence of physical violence, insulting language or behaviour and, marginally, threatening or aggressive behaviour, were slightly

more common in Scotland. The higher incidence of reported physical violence in Scotland derives at least in part from the inclusion there of certain drunken incidents in private dwellings, and may also be indicative of different procedures in formulating charges rather than true differences in behaviour.

14. Obstruction of the police by drunks was much less often reported from Scotland (4%) than from E/W(X) (10%). This may well be a direct outcome of a tendency (described later) for the police who intervene in drunken incidents in Scotland to be older and more experienced officers.

15. A detailed analysis of the persons towards whom insulting language and behaviour was addressed, shows that it was much less frequently directed at the police in Scotland than in E/W(X) (46% and 29%). This again is probably an outcome of the greater experience of the police concerned in Scotland. (Table S7)

16. A detailed analysis of "public nuisance behaviour" showed that not only was such behaviour much less often reported from Scotland, but considerably more of that which was reported involved definite inconvenience, as distinct from possible annoyance, to the public (Table S8). This tends to confirm the hypothesis in paragraph 10 above, that there is a greater tolerance of simple rowdiness among drunks in Scotland than in E/W(X).

17. Average Degree of capability in relation to reported behaviour. On average, *whatever their behaviour*, offenders in Scotland tended to be rated by the police as more capable than their counterparts in E/W(X). ("General public nuisance behaviour" and "urinating" vomiting etc." were associated with the lowest degree of capability in both areas, and physical violence with the highest.) (Table S9)

18. There were certain differences between area in the rank order of the mean "capability scores" associated with different forms of behaviour, but close examination suggests that these are probably accounted for by minor differences in the component items contributing to the behaviour.

19. The greater average degree of capability attributed to those showing *each* form of behaviour in Scotland tends to support the earlier hypothesis that greater tolerance is shown in Scotland for the very drunk (other than the totally incapable) than in E/W(X).*

20. Behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness. A drunk who obstructs the police or damages property in Scotland is much more likely to be charged only with a breach of the peace than his counterpart in E/W(X) is to be charged only with an offence of aggravated drunkenness.

21. These and other examples lead to the conclusion that differences between area in formulating the appropriate charge contribute substantially to the incidence in Scotland of charges against drunks other than those of breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness.

*This interpretation is offered as the one which seems most closely to fit facts which clearly require some explanation, but it is purely hypothetical. Possible cultural differences, for example between attitudes in Scotland and E/W(X) towards "holding ones drink" (i.e. not appearing grossly drunk), have not been considered because the writer is not competent to consider them. The whole subject is one which requires more subtle investigation.

22. Simple drunkenness charges. Those charged with simple drunkenness in Scotland were even less likely than their counterparts in E/W(X) to have shown any form of aggravating behaviour at all. (*Table S11*)

23. Behaviour associated with charges other than those of drunkenness or breach of the peace alone. *Table S12* in the text is an analysis of the behaviour in the two areas associated with: (a) a breach of the peace or drunkenness charge together with a charge for another offence; (b) a different charge or charges only; (c) a charge of breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness only. The comparative results are difficult to evaluate, as are all results comparing charges in the two areas.

24. They are presented in full, and commented on in the text. However, the bases for interpretation are so tenuous that the present summary is best confined to the statement that different sorts of behaviour are too closely entangled with differences in the way charges are formulated to allow for any really conclusive statement to be made.

25. Proportion of each type of behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace or drunkenness only. Every single form of behaviour reported of drunks was more likely to be associated with a charge of drunkenness only in E/W(X) than it was with a charge of breach of the peace only in Scotland.* (*Table S13*)

This fact again emphasises the comparatively limited range of the behaviour covered by a "breach of the peace" charge, and illustrates the difficulty in making meaningful comparisons between areas in which the charges against drunks are formulated according to different principles.

26. The following extreme cases illustrate the difference. Each of the forms of behaviour listed were associated in E/W(X) in at least 70% of cases with a charge of drunkenness only. In at least 70% of cases in Scotland they were associated with a charge or charges other than breach of the peace alone:

- Fighting, physical violence, or attack on strangers
- Assaulting person (of the same or opposite sex)
- Attempts to resist arrest
- Refusing or neglecting to pay bills etc.
- Urinating, defecating

27. Charges against drunks other than charges of drunkenness or breach of the peace. The most marked differences between the two areas concern the higher incidence in Scotland of a number of charges implying violence to the person, and of charges implying urination etc. by drunks. Charges implying theft of a number of kinds were also more common in Scotland than in E/W(X). Some of these and certain other charges reported from Scotland (e.g. malicious mischief; gross indecency) were practically never made against drunks in E/W(X). (*Table S14*)

28. Although certain of the charges occurred more frequently in E/W(X) than in Scotland, this appears to be largely due to the lesser reported incidence in Scotland of the relevant behaviour, which we have discussed earlier. These

*These results, of course, refer to the behaviour associated with various charges and not with the behaviour actually leading directly to the charge. Every item of reported behaviour is, by definition, associated with a charge, though it may form part of a continuum of behaviour which has little or nothing to do with the charge itself.

charges include assaults on the police, obstructing the police, and refusal to quit licenced premises. Charges implying disorderly or unruly behaviour were more common in E/W(X) than in Scotland, but this is consistent with the much higher reported incidence in E/W(X) of the sort of "general public nuisance behaviour" by drunks which one might expect to be associated with such charges.

29. Miscellaneous wounding and assault charges (excluding assaults on police, spouse or relative, common or indecent assault) were rather more common in E/W(X) than in Scotland. But they accounted for less than 1% of charges in either area, and since they were not further analysed, the difference cannot be explained from the data.

III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKEN OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES

30. Sex. Nearly identical proportions of all drunks charged in each area were women (6% Sc, 5% E/W(X)). The only difference of any magnitude between areas in the charges made against the two sexes concerned those charged with using indecent language, 10% of whom were women in Scotland, 4% in E/W(X). (Table S15)

31. Sex and Degree of Incapacity. In both areas the women drunks were much more likely than the men to be totally or nearly totally incapable. This analysis also shows that the greater average capability of drunks in Scotland is chiefly a characteristic of men. (Table S16)

32. Sex and Behaviour. In both areas women offenders more often than men showed no aggravating behaviour; but in Scotland, among both sexes the proportions reported as showing no aggravating behaviour were higher than in E/W(X). This does not reflect a higher incidence of total incapability in Scotland (see Table S2), and is not readily explained. (Table S17)

33. Behaviour of those showing any aggravating behaviour. Among those offenders showing any form of aggravating behaviour men in Scotland were very much more likely (30%) to have used physical violence than were women (18%). The contrast was much more marked than it was in E/W(X). (Table S18)

34. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence was shown by a similar proportion of men as of women in Scotland. In E/W(X) it was appreciably more common among men.

35. Insulting language or behaviour was reported of a majority in three of the four groups under consideration, the only exception being males in E/W(X) (47%). 63% of women in Scotland who showed any form of aggravating behaviour used insulting language or behaviour.

36. Age. Nine age groups were considered. The distribution of offenders in both areas along the age scale was closely similar. (Table S19)

37. The distribution of offenders aged between 18 and 24 was also analysed year by year. Differences between area were again marginal. (Table S20)

38. **Age and Degree of Incapacity.** Within each of the nine age groups closely similar proportions in each area were rated as totally incapable, and this proportion increased systematically with age. (Table S21)

39. In every age-group in Scotland between 17% and 24% were rated as partially incapable—a narrow range of difference. A similar trend as found in E/W(X), but the proportion rated as partially incapable was greater in every age-group than it was in Scotland (range 30%–39%) except among the oldest—70 and over (20%).

40. The proportions in different age groups rated as incoherent only did not differ markedly either within age-group or in total between area.

41. However, the proportions rated as neither incapable nor incoherent declined systematically with age, and in every age group in Scotland the proportion rated in this way was greater than it was in E/W(X).

42. On average, coherence and apparent capability declined with age in Scotland as it did in E/W(X), but in Scotland a greater proportion in every age group appeared capable and coherent.

43. **Charges and Age.** This analysis disregards differences between area in the incidence of offences (already discussed) and considers only differences in the ages of those facing particular charges.

44. The age-distributions of those charged with simple drunkenness, breach of the peace only (Sc) or aggravated drunkenness only (E/W(X)) were closely similar in the two areas.

45. Multiple charges which included one of breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness were rather more common in Scotland in the age-group 30–39 (23%) than they were in E/W(X) (16%).

46. Outstanding differences between area includes:

- i *Obstructing the police.* In Scotland fewer of those facing this charge were in the age-group 18–24 (41%) than in E/W(X) (54%), and considerably more in Scotland (22%) than in E/W(X) (13%) were in the age-group 30–39.
- ii *Assault.* Many fewer in Scotland than in E/W(X) came from the three youngest age-groups (the under-25's) and more from the middle age-groups (30–49). (Sc. younger groups 31%; middle groups 46%; E/W(X) younger groups 57%; middle groups 23%). (Table S22)

These results should be evaluated in the light of two facts; (i) that there were fewer police obstruction charges in Scotland than in E/W(X), and the police concerned tended to be considerably older and more experienced; (ii) that there were more assault charges in Scotland than in E/W(X), and that the admission in Scotland of offences by drunks in private dwellings allowed for the inclusion of some assaults against spouses, relatives etc. which would not have been admitted in E/W(X).

47. **Sex, age and charge.** The age distributions of those charged with simple drunkenness in both areas were similar. Differences between the age distribution of the men and women charged were considerable, but consistent between area.

The same observation holds for those charged with breach of the peace or simple drunkenness only.

48. In Scotland, those charged with other offences were far less likely to be aged under 25, than they were in E/W(X). This is true for both sexes. (Proportions aged under 25: Sc. 38% for men; E/W(X) 53% for men; 24% for women and 34% for women).

49. Among men in Scotland those aged 25-44 accounted for nearly half (49%) of those facing other charges, compared with only 36% in E/W(X). The contrast was less marked among women, and mainly confined to the single age-group 35-44.

50. These results are consistent with other indications that drunks charged with offences other than those of drunkenness or breach of the peace tend to be rather older in Scotland than in E/W(X). The difference is common to both sexes, but is most marked among men. (Table S23)

51. **Marital Status.** Many more offenders in Scotland than in E/W(X) were married (48% and 32%). This does not reflect a difference in the age distribution of offenders. (Table S24)

52. **Residential Status.** Offenders in Scotland (79%) were much more often residents in the area of the reporting police force than was the case in E/W(X) (60%). Smaller proportions in Scotland were temporary residents in the area, persons normally living elsewhere in the British Isles, or persons of no fixed abode. (Table S25)

53. **Residential Status and Charges.** In both areas those charged with simple drunkenness were the least likely to be permanent residents in the area of the reporting police force, and the most likely to be persons of no fixed abode. In Scotland, though not in E/W(X), simple drunkenness offenders were also rather more likely than others to be visitors normally resident outside the area. (Table S26)

54. **Country of Birth.** 92% of those charged in Scotland were of Scottish birth. Only 70% of those charged in E/W(X) were born in either England or Wales, and only two-thirds offended in their country of birth.

55. The Irish-born, principally those born in Eire, were the largest minority group in E/W(X) (16%). This was also true of Scotland, but the minority was much smaller there (4%).

56. 8% of those charged in E/W(X) were of Scottish birth, but only 2% of those charged in Scotland were of English or Welsh birth.

All other minority groups were very small in Scotland, comprising in all about 1%, compared with about 5% in E/W(X). (Table S27)

57. **Total Incapacity and country of birth.** The Irish-born were the most often reported to be totally incapacitated in Scotland (34%). In E/W(X), though more often totally incapacitated than those born in Great Britain, they were no more frequently reported to be in this state than were other Europeans and persons born in any other part of the world. (Textual comment following Table S27)

58. **Employment Status.** There was virtually no difference in the distribution by employment status of offenders in the two areas. Well over half were manual

workers (57-58%). 22-23% were not in employment at the time of the incident. 8% in Scotland and 12% in E/W(X) were casual or seasonal workers, seamen (on shore leave) or members of HM forces. (Table S29)

59. **Charges and Employment Status.** A comparative analysis was made between areas of charges by employment status. Certain differences were apparent, but they are difficult to interpret and may possibly be due in part to differences between areas in the way charges against drunks are formulated. (Details are given in Table S30)

60. **Number of persons accompanying.** In Scotland (96%) those charged with simple drunkenness were even more likely to be totally incapacitated than was the case in E/W(X) (91%).

In Scotland those charged with a breach of the peace only were rather more often accompanied (49%) than were aggravated drunkenness offenders in E/W(X) (42%). But those charged with multiple offences were more likely to be unaccompanied in Scotland than in E/W(X). There is no indication that the lesser average extent of the grosser physical manifestations of drunkenness in Scotland is accompanied by greater sociability among those charged with offences. (Table S31)

61. **Behaviour of Solitary Offenders.** In Scotland those charged with the following offences were much more likely than in E/W(X) to be on their own at the time of police intervention (differences of 10% or more):

Sexual behaviour

Obstructing the police

Theft

Urinating, vomiting etc.

The implication of these differences is not clear (Table S32). (Possibly the lesser incidence of police obstruction in Scotland is associated with a lesser likelihood of obstruction being a group activity. Theft in Scotland includes a greater proportion of miscellaneous thefts from public places than it does in E/W(X), and this might be expected to be a solitary activity. Vomiting in Scotland (unlike urinating) is seldom used as a separate charge; it may be that vomiting is associated with solitude in the same way as a high degree of incapacity is so associated.)

62. **Degree of Incapacity of Solitary offenders.** The proportions who were unaccompanied in Scotland was greater in Scotland than in England whatever their degree of incapacity.

63. **Number of persons charged as the result of a single incident.** The difference between areas was negligible. 20% in Scotland and 22% in E/W(X) were charged together with one or more other persons involved in the same incident.

64. **Physical Injury and personal material loss.** Some type of injury or personal loss (no distinction was made between the two) was reported in 14% of all cases in Scotland and 11% in E/W(X).

65. Detailed analysis showed that the involvement of spouse or relative was much more common in Scotland (14% of all cases of injury or loss) than in England (1%).

66. The difference is no doubt largely attributable to the slightly different terms of reference used by the Scottish police, which allowed for some cases of drunken assault in private dwellings. However, personal injury or loss to members of the public unknown to the offender, to personal enemies, and to officials (other than the police)* were more common in Scotland than in E/W(X).

This suggests that violence resulting in actual injury is more commonly directed at persons outside the offender's own drinking group in Scotland than it is in E/W(X).

67. *Carrying and Using Weapons.* 2.19% of offenders in Scotland were reported to have carried or used an offensive weapon. Of these 0.99%, or nearly one in a hundred, used it. The figures are much higher than in E/W(X), where 1.23% carried a weapon, of whom 0.23% used it. (Table S36).

68. *Previous convictions known to the police.* In both areas about half of those charged were known to the local police to have a record of previous offences. Because of differences between areas in the way charges are formulated, and possible difficulties in determining which previous records in Scotland referred to breach of the peace while sober and which while drunk, it would be tendentious to attempt close comparisons. (Table S37)

69. Considering only those known for previous convictions of drunkenness or breach of the peace while drunk in Scotland and comparing them with those known for previous convictions for offences of drunkenness in E/W(X), the distribution by number of previous convictions in the two areas is very similar. The majority known to have had any such previous convictions had had three or more, and between 19% (Sc.) and 23% (E/W(X)) had more than ten. (Table S38)

70. *Previous convictions for drunkenness and/or breach of the peace while drunk, and whether any other types of previous convictions known.* In both areas those not known to have had previous convictions for drunkenness etc. were less likely than others to have known convictions for other offences.

But rather over one-third in Scotland and rather over one-fifth in E/W(X) who were not known to have had any previous drunkenness etc. convictions were known to have had other sorts of previous conviction.

71. In Scotland, among those known to have had previous drunkenness etc. convictions, the proportion known to have had other previous convictions as well ranged upwards progressively from 55% of those with only one known previous conviction for drunkenness etc. to 90% of those with more than 25 such convictions. A similar, but less steep progression was found in E/W(X) from 49% of those with only one previous drunkenness conviction to 81% of those with between eleven and twenty-five such convictions. Unlike Scotland, in E/W(X) those with a very large number of previous drunkenness convictions were rather less likely than those with a rather lower record (11-25) to be known to the police for offences other than drunkenness.

72. Reported differences may be in part attributable to difficulties in Scotland in distinguishing retrospectively between breaches of the peace committed while

*The police, as has already been shown, were much less often reported as the 'victims' of any sort of incident in Scotland than in E/W(X).

sober and those committed while drunk. If this is so, similar records of behaviour in the two areas may appear different when described in court.

73. But clearly in both areas a person known to have had previous convictions arising from a state of drunkenness is also very likely to have had previous convictions for other offences as well, and this likelihood increases with the number of his known previous convictions for drunkenness or breach of the peace while drunk. (Table S39)

74. *Celebrations.* Differences between area were slight, and in both areas very few (7% in Scotland; 10% in E/W(X)) said that they were celebrating any particular occasion. The smallness of the proportions in either area who said they were celebrating anything in particular may perhaps indicate a tendency by the public and police to tolerate drunken behaviour on occasions for celebration more than they would at other times. (Table S40)

75. *Type of Drink Consumed.* No information on the type of drink consumed by offenders was obtained by the police in 15-17% of cases for each sex in Scotland and for 16-20% in E/W(X). Such omissions are unlikely to be random ones. Cases of "no information" have been included in the bases of Tables, and proportions quoted as consuming different types of drink are consequently minimal ones.

76. *Of the male drunks charged in Scotland*, at least half had mixed their drinks—usually beer with spirits (33%) but often other mixtures (17%). Relatively few had drunk spirits only (8%), wine being a more common single drink among those charged (14%). Only 14% of offenders were known to have drunk beer alone.

77. This is almost the reverse of the pattern found among *male drunks* charged in E/W(X). There nearly two-thirds were known to have drunk beer alone, and only 12% were known to have mixed their drinks. It was rare for male offenders in E/W(X) to have drunk wine alone (4%); and only about half as many in Scotland had drunk spirits only.

78. *Women offenders in Scotland* had mixed their drinks (28%) more than twice as often as in E/W(X) (12%), but much less frequently than had the men. The beer and spirits mixture, so frequently reported of male offenders in Scotland, was comparatively rare among women (12%). Only 3% of female offenders in Scotland, compared with 37% in E/W(X) were known to have consumed beer alone. (Table S41)

79. *Age and drinks consumed. Beer only.* The small number of offenders who had drunk beer alone in Scotland tended to be concentrated in the three youngest age-groups. Half of them were aged under 25. In E/W(X), where beer only was the most common drink of offenders 38% were in these younger age groups.

80. *Spirits only.* This was a minority drink among offenders in both areas. Drinkers of spirits only in Scotland were distributed in much the same way as the sample as a whole. In E/W(X) 30.5% of spirits-only drinkers charged were aged 18-29, compared with 40% in Scotland.

81. *Mixed spirits and beer.* Although this was the most commonly reported drink of offenders in Scotland, but comparatively rare in E/W(X), the age-distribution of those who had drunk this mixture was fairly similar in both areas.

82. **Other mixed drinks.** In E/W(X) offenders aged 18-29 were under-represented among those who had drunk other mixed drinks (26.5%, compared with 42% of all offenders, fell in this group). In Scotland the proportion in these age groups who had consumed other mixed drinks was similar to that among all offenders (39% and 40%).

83. **Wines.** In both areas, under-age offenders tended to be slightly over-represented among wine drinkers (possibly a reflexion of young people drinking "light" drinks, such as champagne ciders or perries with a high alcoholic content, when not accustomed to drinking). In both areas those aged 50 and over (in each of the three age bands comprising this group) tended to be over-represented among wine-drinkers (probably these include drinkers of cheap wines leading to quick intoxication).

84. **Cider and Methylated Spirits.** For cider, as for wine, and possibly for the same reason, there seems to be some tendency for under-age offenders to be over-represented, and for each age-group between 20-24 and 30-39 to be under-represented. At least half of the small number of offenders who had drunk methylated spirits in either area were aged 50 or over (compared with 17% and 16% of all offenders. (Table S42)

85. **Type of Drink—the young and the old compared.** In the following comments we refer to those aged under 25 as "the young", and to those aged 50 and over as "the old".

86. **The young offenders contributed most to beer-only drinking in both areas, but most markedly in Scotland.** In Scotland they contributed as much to the drinking of spirits only as did offenders in general; in E/W(X) substantially less. They contributed slightly less in Scotland to the drinking of *mixed beer and spirits*; in E/W(X) slightly more. In both areas their contribution to *wine drinking* fell far below the contribution of offenders in general. Very few indeed drank methylated spirits.

87. **The old offenders contributed 52±6% of methylated spirits drinkers in both areas.** In both areas they contributed much more to *wine* and *cider* drinking than they did to drinking in general. Their contribution to spirits-only drinking was much the same in both areas as their total contribution. The same is true of their contribution to the drinking of *mixed beer and spirits* and of *other mixed drinks* in Scotland. In E/W(X), however, they contributed less to beer and spirits drinking, and more to the drinking of *other mixed drinks* than they did to drinking in general. In both areas, but most markedly in Scotland, they contributed less to beer-only drinking than they did to drinking in general. (Table S43)

88. **Persons taken into custody for their own protection.** In relation to type of drink. It is reasonable to assume that those offenders showing no aggravating behaviour at all are taken into custody primarily for their own protection—though of course there are other reasons for clearing the streets of "flat out" drunks.

Despite the entirely different drinking habits of drunks in the two areas, the proportions of drinkers of similar drinks who showed no aggravating behaviour varied very little between areas. The only outstanding difference was that between drinkers of spirits only, 37% of whom showed no aggravating behaviour in Scotland and 51% in England.

89. Arranged in rank order, starting with the drink most frequently associated with no aggravating behaviour, offenders who had consumed each type of drink showed no aggravating behaviour in the following order of frequency:

Drink	Rank order of percentage of offenders showing no aggravating behaviour	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
Methylated spirits	1	1
Cider only	2	2
Wine only	3	3
Mixed drinks other than beer and spirits	4	4
Beer and spirits mixed	5	5
Spirits only	6	7
Beer only	7	6

In view of the fact that we have no information on the *quantities* of drink consumed, this comparison between drink-type within area shows a remarkably close correspondence between the incapacitating qualities of the drinks themselves. (Table S44)

90. Aggravating behaviour in relation to type of drink consumed. The very different distribution of the different drinks between offenders does not appear to have had any marked affect on the distribution of aggravating behaviour between areas, among those showing aggravating behaviour.

91. Employment Status and type of drink. There were two striking similarities between areas. Drinkers of beer only, though common among offenders in E/W(X) and rare in Scotland, were distributed almost identically by employment status in each area. About two-thirds were manual workers and about one-fifth unemployed. Three-quarters of the drinkers of methylated spirits were unemployed in both areas.

92. Drinkers of each of the following types of drink in Scotland were much more often in manual employment, and much less often unemployed, casual or seasonal workers than was the case in E/W(X).

- Spirits only
- Beer and spirits mixed
- Other mixed drinks

93. In E/W(X) there was also a marked tendency for wine drinkers to include an exceptionally high proportion of unemployed etc. In fact, in E/W(X) there is much support for the contention that the unemployed offender tends to consume the drinks or mixtures of drinks popularly associated with getting drunk quickly.

94. In Scotland the situation appears different, but it suggested that this may well be no more than a reflexion of broad differences in drinking habits between the areas. Mixed drinks and spirits are probably more widely acceptable socially among heavy drinkers as "normal" in Scotland than they are in E/W(X). Consequently the person aiming at getting drunk quickly is more likely in Scotland to find himself drinking the same drink or mixture as other persons who get drunk and commit an offence. (Table S46)

95. Note on paras. 91-94. It must be emphasised that nothing can be inferred from the above comments about the speed with which offenders in general

reach the state of intoxication at which they are liable to commit an offence. This has to do with the amounts consumed, with which the present inquiry was not concerned.

IV CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT

96. *Time of Day.* Licencing hours in Scotland are fixed throughout the country by the Licencing (Scotland) Act 1962 (Weekdays 11.00 am to 2.30 pm; 5.00 pm to 10.00 pm. Sundays 12.30 pm to 2.30 pm; 6.30 pm to 10.00 pm). In E/W(X) permitted hours vary between Licencing Authority, and Licencing Justices may make orders altering them. The most important and most general difference, from the point of view of this enquiry, is that in E/W(X) permitted hours very frequently extend for half an hour longer in the evening than they do in Scotland; but there are other differences which may affect the results.

97. Ignoring differences which clearly are or may be associated with different licensing hours, the outstanding difference between the two areas was that in Scotland a greater proportion of charges originated *during* opening hours, particularly in the earlier part of the evening than was the case in E/W(X). While this might be associated with a tendency for Scottish offenders to get drunk more quickly than those in E/W(X), this possible inference should be treated with extreme caution. *Anticipating* earlier closing times might well have an affect.

98. It is worth noting, however, that irrespective of the cause, a bye-product of this trend may be to make the drunkenness problem more apparent to the ordinary citizen in Scotland than in E/W(X), since he is more likely to see a drunkenness offender during the times at which he is most likely to frequent the street.

99. *Incapacity and Time of Day.* Differences in licencing hours make it impossible meaningfully to compare the areas in this respect, except on a very broad basis. We have considered three periods.

- i "*Peak Hours*". (a) shortly before 10.00 pm to shortly before 11.45 pm, and (b) shortly before midnight to shortly after 12.45 pm.
- ii *Night.* Shortly before 1.00 am to shortly after 4.45 am.
- iii *Morning till before the end of licencing hours in either area.* Shortly before 5.00 am to before 9.45 pm. Very few charges (1%) originate in this period before 10.45 am, so that the period broadly covers the time between the earliest opening hours in the morning till shortly before the earliest evening closing time.

100. In both areas the totally or nearly totally incapacitated were quite heavily under-represented in the two main peak hours for charges.

101. In Scotland there was a systematic tendency for the more capable to be the more heavily represented in these hours. In E/W(X), the contrast was only between the most highly incapacitated and the rest.

102. In both areas the most highly incapacitated were quite heavily over-represented during the morning and till before the end of evening closing hours.

In Scotland there was a systematic tendency for the less capable to be the more heavily represented—proportions ranging from 50% of the most highly incapacitated to 31% of those neither any degree of incapacity nor incoherence.

103. In both areas, in the hour between shortly before midnight and during the rest of the night offenders in differing degrees of incapacity were represented in similar proportions to those found among offenders as a whole.

104. Incidents in the peak hours thus less often involved highly intoxicated offenders, and those in the day and before evening closing time more often involved them, than would be expected from the total distribution of offences originating between these times. This is true of both areas, but in *Scotland* there was a systematic tendency, not found in E/W(X) for representation to decline with each degree of manifest drunkenness, and to increase in the day and before closing time.

105. Very drunk offenders tend to commit their offences before evening closing time, *most markedly in Scotland*. It may be that closing time is associated with a gregariousness which tends to be incompatible with "flat out" drunkenness. But, whatever the explanation, the ostentatiously drunk offender in Scotland appears in public over a longer period of the evening than in E/W(X). (*Table S48*)

106. *Day of the Week*. In both areas charges predominantly referred to incidents on Fridays and particularly Saturdays. The concentration on both of these days was greater in Scotland than in E/W(X). (Total on these days: Sc. 63%; E/W(X) 53%), and the proportion of charges originating on each other day of the week in Scotland was less. Otherwise the pattern in both areas was similar, with Tuesdays and Wednesdays representing the smallest proportions of charges (6-7% each), Mondays slightly more (7-10%), and Thursdays rather more again (10-12%). (*Table S49*)

107. *Behaviour on Fridays and Saturdays*. Every form of aggravating behaviour was more heavily concentrated into the Friday-Saturday period in Scotland than it was in E/W(X).

108. In both areas offenders on Friday and Saturdays were more likely than all offenders to have:

- shown some form of aggravating behaviour
- shown some form of physical violence.

In Scotland they were also more likely to have urinated or vomited.

109. In both areas they were less likely than on other days to have committed petty theft or fraud.

110. The difference between the two areas on these days seems to lie at two extremes—a predominance of actual violence (though not of threats) in Scotland, suggestive of the active and most highly aggressive drunk; and a predominance of urinating and vomiting, suggestive of minimal self-control. (*Table S50*)

111. *Charges on Fridays and Saturdays*. Examination of the distribution of charges, as distinct from behaviour, adds to and slightly modifies the above impressions:

- i Charges of possessing an offensive weapon were over-represented in both areas on Fridays and Saturdays. While this is consistent with the overall picture of violent behaviour, the actual numbers were small in both areas.
- ii Assault charges were *not* over represented in Scotland on these days (though they were in E/W(X)). It is inferred that, although violent behaviour is more common on Fridays and Saturdays in Scotland than on other days, *extreme* violence of the sort that may lead to an assault charge is not. Probably the predominance of violent behaviour on these days in Scotland reflects more fist-fights between drinking companions rather than serious assaults on others.
- iii Charges of using offensive language were more common in both areas on Fridays and Saturdays than they were among offenders in general, but the use of such language was no more frequently reported. It is inferred that the language used tended to be more offensive, though no more common, on Fridays and Saturdays than on other nights. (Table S51)

112. **Incapacity and Day of the week.** On each day except Saturday, in both areas, offenders were distributed through the week in a very similar way. On Saturday the highly incapacitated were slightly under-represented, and the most capable over-represented. The differences were marginal. If, in fact, there is little real difference between days in the proportion of offenders who are "flat out" this result lends no support to any suggestion that the police might tend to overlook drunks who were principally a danger to themselves in favour of arresting the more menacing ones. (Table S52)

113. **Charges related to place where incident occurred.** 71% of charges in Scotland and 73% in E/W(X) originated from incidents in the street.

114. The terms of reference to which the Scottish police were working admitted the inclusion of some drunken incidents in private places which would not be legally classified as "offences of drunkenness". The *overall* effect of this difference is not large, though it has a substantial influence on the incidence of certain minority charges—principally those of violence.

115. 6% of charges in Scotland and 2% in E/W(X) originated in the offender's home.* 8% in Scotland and 7% in E/W(X) originated in miscellaneous buildings doorways, gardens etc. (These include all other types of private property, together with some other places where an offence connected with a drunkenness offence might take place—e.g. urinating against the outside of a front door or the wall of a house).

116. In Scotland 41% of all charges of *assault* originated in incidents in the offenders dwelling, 17% in miscellaneous buildings, doorways etc.—a total of 58% of all such charges, compared with only 16% in E/W(X).

117. Other charges against drunks which more frequently originated in incidents in private dwellings, miscellaneous buildings etc. in Scotland than in E/W(X) were:

Obstructing the police	(Sc. 33%; E/W(X) 16%)
Damage to property	(Sc. 22%; E/W(X) 11%)
Theft	(Sc. 31%; E/W(X) 18%)
Possessing offensive weapon	(Sc. 14%; E/W(X) 7%)

*We have no exact indication of the number of persons who were taken into custody from inside the home, since the police were asked to say where the incident originated, not when the arrest took place.

118. Although these are charges applying to minorities, the total effect of the different terms of reference is probably to exaggerate the true differences between the areas in respect of violence to persons and property by drunks.

119. These differences should, however, be evaluated in the light of later evidence that *all* offences by drunks which were charged in Scotland as specific non-drunkness offences were more often reported to the police by members of the public in Scotland than was the case in E/W(X) (c.f. paras 137-139).

120. **Public Houses.** An outstanding difference between the two areas was that the incidents leading to every single charge less frequently (usually *much* less frequently) originated in a public house in Scotland than in E/W(X). (Table S53)

121. **Charges which did not originate in street incidents.** In Scotland the following charges *much more* often originated in incidents away from the street than was the case in E/W(X);

- A. Multiple charges in general
 - Assault charges
 - Damage to property
 - Urinating and vomiting

The following *much less* often originated from incidents away from the street.

- B. Simple drunkenness charges
 - Indecent language

122. The significance of the first three items in group A should be evaluated cautiously because of the admission by the Scottish police of some offences on private property. The difference in urinating and vomiting is possibly due to geographical factors, since it is mainly accounted for by the greater prevalence of this behaviour on open land etc. in Scotland. (Table S54)

123. The differences in group B are both general ones, not associated with any one particular type of locality.

124. **The Officers who first intervened in incidents leading to a charge.** In Scotland, the officers who first intervened in each incident tended to be of higher rank, to have longer police service, and to be older than in E/W(X). The differences were outstanding. In summary:

<i>First Officer to intervene</i>	<i>Scotland</i>	<i>E/W(X)</i>	
<i>Rank</i> Sergeant or above	11.6%	5.5%	(Table S55)
<i>Age</i> Under 25	18.1%	41.6%	(Table S56)
Over 30	90.9%	28.4%	
<i>Length of Service</i>			
1½ years or less	11.9%	34.7%	(Table S57)
Over 10½ years	35.2%	18.1%	

125. These differences may well account for the much less frequent conflicts by drunks with the police in Scotland (both physical and verbal). (cf. Table S5 Item 4(iv) and Item 6 (i-iv))

126. **Officers Duties at time of intervention.** Differences between area were comparatively slight. 63.3% in Scotland and 69.8% in E/W(X) were on normal uniform patrol on foot or cycle; 24.5% in Scotland and 22.8% in E/W(X) were on motorised uniform patrol.

127. In Scotland 4.4% of intervening officers were on plain clothes duty (other than CID), compared with only 0.7% in E/W(X). This may possibly be accounted for by the inclusion of certain incidents in private dwellings in the Scottish sample. (Table S58)

128. How an officer came to be present at the scene. In about two-thirds of all cases in both areas the officer came upon the incident leading to a charge in the course of his normal duties.

129. The police were less often called by management in Scotland (4%) than in E/W(X) (7%), and less often by members of the public who did not consider themselves personally affected (Sc. 11%; E/W(X) 16%).

130. But the police in Scotland were twice as often (13% of all cases) as in E/W(X) (6%) called by members of the public complaining of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to own property etc.

131. The results are consistent with our earlier inferences that the public (and publicans) in Scotland tend to be more tolerant than in E/W(X) of the less menacing type of drunk, and that charges tend to be concentrated, for this reason, on the more menacing. (Table S60)

132. Behaviour associated with incidents at which the police arrived as the result of an outside call. In Scotland (2% and 14%) both publicans and public were much less likely than in E/W(X) (7% and 25%) to be the source of information to the police about simple drunks who showed no aggravating behaviour. This is in line with other data suggesting that in Scotland people are less perturbed by (or more indifferent to) "harmless" drunks than in E/W(X).

133. The public (but *not* management) were responsible for reporting many more incidents of physical violence (43%) to the police in Scotland than in E/W(X) (19%). The comparison must be interpreted cautiously in the light of the inclusion of some incidents in private dwellings in Scotland. (*But see below paras 137-139*)

134. Every single form of aggravating behaviour was more often brought to police attention by the public in Scotland than it was in E/W(X). (Table S61)

135. Every type of charge apart from charges of drunkenness or breach of the peace only, urinating, vomiting, or indecent language, more often originated in an incident to which the police were called by the public in Scotland than was the case in E/W(X). (Table S62)

136. Two alternative inferences could be drawn:

i that the public are more inclined to complain *about the same* things to the police in Scotland as they are in E/W(X).

or ii that drunken behaviour tends to take a more extreme form in Scotland than it does in E/W(X) before it is felt to warrant a complaint or a charge.

In the light of earlier results, the latter interpretation seems the more acceptable.

137. Charges in relation to how the police came to be present. Comparison between areas in this respect is complicated by the fact that the behaviour

leading to many specific non-drunkenness charges in Scotland might well have led to an aggravated drunkenness charge only in E/W(X). The following points appear to indicate true differences.

138. Incidents reported by management resulted in smaller proportions of every type of charge in Scotland than they did on E/W(X). This confirms other suggestions that publicans played a smaller part in Scotland than in E/W(X) in supplying the police with information leading to a charge.

139. Unaffected members of the public in Scotland less often reported incidents to the police which led to a charge of simple drunkenness than they did in E/W(X). This confirms other suggestions of greater public indifference in Scotland to the sight of "harmless drunks".

140. There was little difference between areas in the sources from which police heard of persons charged with breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness.

141. The main difference between areas lay in the greater frequency with which incidents leading to *non-drunkenness* charges in Scotland originated from incidents reported by members of the public who claimed to be personally affected. Apart from the inference suggested in para. 139 above, it seems possible that in Scotland the charge arising from a specific complaint by the public tends more than it would in E/W(X) to be formulated directly in accordance with the act complained of. (Table S62)

I BACKGROUND

(i) **The basis for comparison.** Provision was made in the instructions given to the police in England and Wales for details to be returned in respect of any charges against intoxicated persons which were sometimes used as *alternatives* to charges of drunkenness, and also details of "borderline cases", in which the alleged offender was not sufficiently drunk to merit a charge of drunkenness, but had he been *more* drunk would, in the opinion of the officer concerned, have been charged **ONLY** with an offence of simple or aggravated drunkenness or an equivalent alternative charge. Less than 4% either in the Metropolitan Police District or in the rest of England and Wales fell into either of these two categories. The remaining 96-97% were all charged with an offence of drunkenness, either with or without an additional, non-drunkenness, charge.

It was known from the published criminal statistics for Scotland that charges of aggravated drunkenness ("drunk and disorderly" etc.) were rarely made in Scotland. In 1965, for example, there were only 140 such charges in that country, compared with 13,594 charges of simple drunkenness ("drunk and incapable").

Pilot work quickly established that the majority of those who would probably have been charged with an offence of aggravated drunkenness in England and Wales were charged with a breach of the peace in Scotland. This is accounted for not by a difference of law, but in the exercise of prosecution discretion.

It was also apparent that a substantial proportion of the charges reported from Scotland were neither charges of drunkenness, nor of breach of the peace (alone or in conjunction with another offence). This was in no way surprising since an offence of aggravated drunkenness may reflect behaviour which does not fall within the compass of a breach of the peace charge. Examples include charges of damage to property, assault, etc.

As we have remarked in the first part of this report, any person liable to a charge of aggravated drunkenness is behaving in a manner which would render him liable to some other charge if he were not drunk. The practice in Scotland, with a few exceptions, appears to be to charge drunks—other than simple drunks—in the same way as they would be charged if they were not drunk.

It was necessary, in order to encompass approximately the same field in Scotland as in England and Wales to instruct the Scottish police to report not only on alleged offences of drunkenness (with or without another charge), but also on those liable to be charged with:

"Any other offence, IF the offenders conduct was clearly affected by drink AND the offence with which he was charged, or likely to be charged, was no more serious than one of drunkenness".

This is not a precise equivalent of the instruction issued for England and Wales to report on:

"Any other offence IF the offenders conduct was clearly affected by drink and a charge commonly used as an *alternative* to one of drunkenness is made".

The slight difference in wording was felt to be essential since it was not clear, in view of the fact that the charge of aggravated drunkenness is little used in

Scotland, whether the wide variety of charges made against persons under the influence of drink would, in practice, necessarily be thought of by individual officers as *alternatives* to a drunkenness charge.

Since (except in cases of simple drunkenness) the degree of intoxication was rarely an essential part of the charge in Scotland, it was a subjective assessment by the police which determined whether an alleged offender was considered so "clearly affected by drink" as to be included in the survey. It is possible that some of the Scottish cases were less affected than their "drunk and disorderly" counterparts in England and Wales, though the instruction to include "border-line cases" in the latter countries was intended to bring the less-drunk within the scope of the enquiry. The internal evidence cannot be considered conclusive. More offenders (other than simple drunks) in Scotland than in England and Wales were classified by the police as neither incapable nor incoherent—but it will be remembered that a similar contrast was found within England and Wales between the Metropolitan Police District and the rest of those countries when those charged with aggravated drunkenness were compared.

Breach of the peace and other charges commonly used in Scotland against intoxicated persons can relate to offences in private dwellings, whereas charges of drunkenness can be made only when the offence occurs in a public place. This will have added to the Scottish returns a certain number of cases which would not have been eligible for inclusion in England and Wales unless under the "alternative charge" category. The police were required to classify the place where each incident *started* rather than where the alleged offender was intercepted, which makes it impossible to state the extent to which police intervention took place within the home. Outside the MPD in England and Wales 2% of all charges *originated* in the home of one of the persons charged and 2% in other dwellings. The corresponding figures for Scotland were 6% and 3%. The internal evidence suggests that the qualifying incidents in dwellings in Scotland which would not have qualified for inclusion in England and Wales consisted to a large extent of domestic troubles, often resulting in a charge of assault.

(ii) **The Sample.** The total number of separate police forces in Scotland at the time of this enquiry was only 31 (it has since been still further reduced by amalgamations). These forces consisted of—

Type of force	Number of such forces
Counties of cities	4
Large burghs	9
Counties	18

The sample of participating forces was selected in the same manner as the provincial forces in England and Wales. The forces were first listed according to type, and 50%* of forces of each type were then chosen at random. These forces returned forms relating to each charge of the types described, during the same period as the provincial forces in England and Wales (November 1964 till April 1966).

With so few forces of the first two types from which to draw a sample, this method of sampling was not ideal. It would have been better to have taken all forces from the counties of cities and the burghs, then preferably to have obtained complete returns from these, and subsequently weighted down the

*Four of the nine large burghs were selected.

results; or alternatively to have drawn samples of sub-divisions or other appropriate units within each force to submit returns. The first method would have placed a very heavy additional burden of paper-work on the police. The second would have imposed administrative tasks and paper-work on additional forces; and, since the number of appropriate units within any one force was small, could have led to distortion through the chance inclusion of special problem areas within a given force.

It is not possible to check fully on the representativeness of the sample in terms of the proportion of charges originating in different types of force, since data are available from published statistics only in respect of charges of simple drunkenness. Breaches of the peace arising from drunkenness are not differentiated from other breaches of the peace. However, taking simple drunkenness charges only, the following Table shows the proportion of simple drunkenness charges proved in 1965* which originated in each type of force, and the proportions in the sample originating in the same types of force.

TABLE A
Charges of simple drunkenness in Scotland

Type of force	Number		Percentage		Difference between actual and sample
	Actual 1965	Sample	Actual 1965	Sample	
Counties of cities	N 7117	N 8077	% 52.4	% 57.8	+ 5.4%
Large burghs	2371	2572	17.4	18.4	+ 1.0%
Counties	4106	3320	30.2	23.8	- 6.4%
Total	13594	13969	100%	100%	

These results are not wholly satisfactory because of the appreciable under-representation of the charges within county forces, and the over-representation of those within the forces of the counties of cities.

Amalgamations of forces since the time of the present enquiry have made this distinction between force-types largely obsolete, and there would be little practical value in examining in any detail the differences between the types of force as they were at the time this sample was drawn.

It is, however, noteworthy that the proportions of all charges which were for simple drunkenness only were closely similar in the counties and in the counties of cities, respectively, but that a very different result was obtained from the large burghs. This implies that the over-representation of cases from the counties of cities, and the under-representation of those from the counties, will have had little effect on the basic structure of the sample in terms of the ratio of passive to active drunks. The large burghs which contributed only a small minority of all cases, represented approximately the correct proportion of simple (passive) drunkenness charges in the sample, so that the marked difference in the ratio of passive to active drunks in these forces will not have led to bias in the overall results.

**Criminal Statistics for Scotland, 1965* (Offence No. 59/1).

The proportion of all cases reported which were for charges of simple drunkenness only, and the forces forming the sample, are shown below.

	<i>Proportion of all charges in sample which were charges of simple drunkenness</i>
<i>Countries of cities</i>	
Edinburgh	} 35.1%
Glasgow	
<i>Countries</i>	
Ayrshire	} 37.1%
Caithness-shire	
Dunbartonshire	
Inverness-shire	
Lothians and Peebles	
Orkney	
Renfrew and Bute	
Scottish North-Eastern Counties	
Pife	
<i>Large burghs</i>	
Greenock	} 62.4%
Hamilton	
Kilmarnock	
Motherwell and Wishaw	

(iii) Notes on the Scottish Tables

1. As was the case in England and Wales, certain of the Scottish Tables are based on calculations made on E.A.M. machines at six-monthly intervals while the enquiry was in progress, and the remainder are based on computer tabulations. As in England and Wales there is a slight discrepancy between the total samples derived from the two sources, the computer base being slightly smaller:-

	<i>Bases, all persons charged</i>	
<i>E.A.M.</i>	<i>Computer</i>	<i>Difference</i>
36111	36072	-39

It has proved impossible definitely to trace the reason for this discrepancy, but it is believed to be mainly attributable to deletions through the removal of duplicated cards at the final editing stage before the data were transferred to the computer. The deletions are believed to be randomly distributed, and cannot materially affect the results. Tables derived from the computer are marked "C" in the top left hand corner, and those derived from E.A.M. calculations are marked "H".

2. Several Tables concerning items about which the number of cases in which no information was supplied by the police was comparatively small, are calculated on the basis of the numbers for which the relevant information was available. This implies that the bases in certain tables are, or add to, less than the expected totals indicated in paragraph 1 above.

This is also true of the corresponding Tables for England and Wales.

3. The number of the corresponding Table in the section of the report dealing with England and Wales is given in brackets alongside each Table in the present section of the report for easy reference. However, in a few cases more extensive information is given in this part of the report than the first. This was felt to be desirable when certain items (e.g. certain charges) occurred more frequently in

Scotland than in England and Wales. In such cases small proportions omitted from the original England and Wales Tables have been inserted to emphasise comparisons.

4. Table S1 (E/W9) which immediately follows explains our reason for comparing the results for Scotland with those for England and Wales *outside the MPD*. This Table also shows that charges of aggravated drunkenness, and of drunkenness at the same time as another offence, were each made against only 0.5% of the Scottish offenders. In all subsequent Tables these small numbers have been included amongst those charged either with breach of the peace alone, or with breach of the peace and another charge.

(iv) Comparison of the distribution of the main types of charge reported in Scotland, the MPD and the rest of England and Wales

Note: Tables are henceforth numbered sequentially for Scotland, the number being prefixed with the letter "S". The number of the corresponding Table for England and Wales is given in brackets (e.g. Table S1 (E/W9)). In the text and in Tables S2 onwards the abbreviation "E/W(X)" is used to refer to "England and Wales excluding the MPD".

Table S1 is a comparison between the distribution of the main types of charge made against alleged offenders in Scotland, the MPD and the rest of England and Wales.

TABLE S1 (E/W9)
The main types of charge

Charge	Scotland	E/W (excl. MPD)	MPD
1. Simple drunkenness only	38.7 %	35.9 %	67.0 %
2. Drunkenness with aggravations only	0.5	48.4	27.1
Breach of the peace only	36.6		
3. Drunkenness at the same time as another offence	0.5	12.2	2.0
Se. Breach of the peace with another charge	6.9		
4. Intoxicated persons charged with an offence(s) not mentioned above	16.8	3.4	3.8
No information	—	—	0.1
Bases (Number of persons)	36072	34597	13711

Only the charge of simple drunkenness is directly comparable between countries. It will be seen that about 39% of persons charged in Scotland, 36% of those charged in England and Wales outside the MPD, but 67% of those charged in the MPD were charged with simple drunkenness only.

In this respect the results for Scotland are very similar to those in England and Wales outside the MPD, but very different from those for the MPD.

A charge of breach of the peace only, made against an intoxicated person in Scotland may be taken as equivalent to one of drunkenness with aggravations only in England and Wales; and similarly a charge of breach of the peace with another charge may be taken as equivalent to a charge of drunkenness at the same time as another offence.

It is impossible to say how the substantial section of the Scottish sample (nearly 17%) who were charged neither with an offence of drunkenness nor with a breach of the peace would have been charged in England or Wales. However, aggravated drunkenness charges are applicable to a wider range of behaviour than breaches of the peace, and it seems probable that an appreciable number among this 17% would have been charged with an offence of aggravated drunkenness had the offence taken place in England or Wales. Any such tendency would have the effect of making the Scottish results approximate more closely to those for England and Wales outside the MPD, and less closely to those for the MPD than is apparent from the Table.

For the reasons outlined it seems clear that these broad overall results from Scotland are much more similar to those for England and Wales outside the MPD than they are to those for the MPD.

We have already compared the MPD and the rest of England and Wales in the first part of this report.

This second part of the report compares (as closely as is possible in the light of the difference between countries in the ways in which the prosecution exercise their discretion when deciding what charge to make against intoxicated persons other than simple drunks) the results from Scotland with those from England and Wales outside the MPD.

II CHARGES AND BEHAVIOUR

(i) *Introduction.* We have shown (Table S1) that the proportions of all persons charged who were charged with simple drunkenness only were very similar in Scotland and in England and Wales outside the MPD. The MPD differed from the rest of England and Wales not only in that a much higher proportion of charges reported were for simple drunkenness only, but also that many more of those charged either with aggravated drunkenness, or with drunkenness at the same time as another offence, were rated by the police in the MPD as being to some extent incapable, compared with their counterparts in the rest of England and Wales.

In setting out to compare the results for Scotland with those for England and Wales outside the MPD we thus start with the precedent that those facing aggravated *drunkenness* charges may differ greatly from one area to another in their degree of incapacity. Whatever differences may be found between the results for Scotland and those for England and Wales outside the MPD in relation to the degree of incapacity of the alleged offenders may therefore be partly true differences between those committing like offences while drunk, and partly attributable to the more subjective criteria used by the police in Scotland in deciding who to include within the scope of the enquiry, owing to the fact that the charge of aggravated drunkenness is little used in Scotland.

It should perhaps be emphasised at the outset of this part of the report that those overt physical manifestations of drunkenness (total or partial incapability, or incoherence) by which we have measured the degree of incapacity of drunks cover only the most easily recognisable and clearly defined aspects of drunkenness. The so-called "fighting drunk", for example, may show none of these signs. Insulting words or behaviour may be the early manifestations of alcohol-based exuberance amongst people who would behave in a similar way after a social get-together when no alcohol was served, and in such cases might well neither display any of the major physical symptoms of drunkenness, nor show any indication that they had drunk much alcohol.

Secondly, it should be emphasised that the difference in the types of drink consumed by offenders in Scotland and in E/W(X) may lead to different manifestations of drunkenness in the two areas. Half of the males charged in Scotland had mixed their drinks (usually beer with spirits), compared with only 12% in E/W(X). Only 11% of males charged in Scotland had been drinking beer alone compared with 63% in E/W(X).

Thirdly, certain of the most innocuous and least threatening forms of behaviour reported of those charged in E/W(X) were comparatively rarely reported from Scotland. The difference is of very considerable magnitude, and it seems most improbable that it derives directly from actual differences between the behaviour of drunks in the two areas. A much more likely explanation, on the face of it, is that there is a difference between areas in the way in which the police exercise the discretion they must inevitably use as to whether or not to exercise their powers of arrest.

We shall suggest, on the basis of results about to be presented, that the exercise of discretion by the police was probably influenced to a considerable extent by

the degree of tolerance by residents in the neighbourhoods where drunks are to be found; that in Scotland the residents are probably more tolerant of mere drunken rowdiness than those in E/W(X); and, by extension, of those who are to some extent incapable or incoherent, as distinct from those who are better able to co-ordinate and sustain their activities. The police in Scotland, it will be suggested, thus tend to concentrate their attention particularly on those drunks whose behaviour appears to some extent threatening to others, rather than on those whose behaviour is little more than a nuisance. (It should be noted that there is no reason to believe that these observations apply to the "flat out" drunk who may need to be taken in custody for his own protection).

(ii) **Degree of incapacity.** Table S2 compares the distribution of police ratings of the degree of incapacity of all those charged in Scotland and in E/W(X):—

TABLE S2 (E/W10)
Degree of Incapacity

Degree of Incapacity	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. Totally or nearly totally incapable	28 %	30 %
2. Partially incapable	21 %	36 %
3. Incoherent only	11 %	8 %
4. None of the above	40 %	26 %
Bases (no. of offenders)	36111	34642

Similar proportions in Scotland (28 %) and in E/W(X) were rated as totally or nearly totally incapable, but many fewer in Scotland (21 % compared with 36 %) were rated as partially incapable, and many more as neither incapable nor incoherent (40 % compared with 26 %).

Table S3 (E/W11) shows the degree of incapacity of those charged with simple drunkenness only; those charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland or with aggravated drunkenness only in E/W(X); and those charged with breach of the peace (Sc) or drunkenness (E/W(X)) at the same time as another offence or offences.

TABLE S3 (E/W11)
Degree of incapacity by charge

Degree of Incapacity	Simple drunkenness		Breach of the peace only (Sc) Aggravated drunkenness only (E/W)		Breach of the peace (Sc), Drunkenness (E/W) at the same time as another offence(s)	
	Scotland %	E/W(X) %	Scotland %	E/W(X) %	Scotland %	E/W(X) %
Totally or nearly totally incapable	72 } 96	77 } 99	1 } 21	2 } 49	1 } 21	3 } 43
Partially incapable	24	22	20	47	20	40
Incoherent	3	1	16	13	14	11
None of the above	1	*	63	38	65	46
Bases (no. of offenders)	13969	12430	13382	16891	2668	4272

*Less than 0.5%.

There was little difference between Scotland and E/W(X) in the distribution of incapability ratings for those charged with simple drunkenness.

Those charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland were much less likely than those charged with aggravated drunkenness only in E/W(X) to be rated as partially incapable (20% and 47%) and much more likely to be rated as neither incapable nor incoherent (63% and 38%).

A similarly marked contrast was found between those charged with breach of the peace and another offence in Scotland (20% partially incapable and 63% neither incapable nor incoherent) and those charged with drunkenness and another offence in E/W(X) (40% and 46%).

In the Table for England and Wales separate results were not given for the degree of incapacity of those charged with an offence other than one of drunkenness, since the majority of these were already included amongst those charged with drunkenness at the same time as another offence, only 3.4% being charged *only* with an offence or offences not being one of drunkenness. The corresponding proportion for Scotland was 16.8%.

It seemed possible that the narrower range of behaviour covered by breach of the peace than by aggravated drunkenness might partially account for the greater degree of incapacity attributed to those charged with the latter offence in E/W(X) when compared with those charged with the former offence in Scotland. The degrees of incapacity associated with all charges other than those of breach of the peace (Sc) or drunkenness (E/W(X)) are shown in Table S4.

TABLE S4

(No corresponding Table in England and Wales report)

Degree of incapacity of those charged with offences other than breach of the peace (Scotland) or drunkenness*

Degree of incapacity	Offences other than breach of the peace or drunkenness	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
Totally or nearly totally incapable	1% 18	3% 37
Partially incapable	15	11
Incoherent	66	49
None of the above		
Base (all offences other than breach of peace (Scotland) or drunkenness (England and Wales (X))	9302	6022

*NB. This Table is based on the number of offences, not on the number of offenders, and incorporates charges made in addition to charges of breach of the peace (Sc) or drunkenness (E & W(X)), as well as charges not made in association with either of the above offences.

It will be seen that the distributions by degree of incapacity shown in this table differ only marginally from those shown in Table S3 for those charged with drunkenness, or breach of the peace, at the same time as another offence.

It is clear that, apart from simple drunks, offenders in Scotland tended on average to be rated as neither incapable nor incoherent more often than their

counterparts in E/W(X). This is not attributable to the different composition of the non-drunkenness and non-breach of the peace charges in the two areas. Detailed analysis showed that for all but one of the fifteen main groups of charge (Groups 4-14 as described in Appendix IVb of Part I), the proportion of offenders in Scotland who were rated as neither incapable nor incoherent was greater than it was in E/W(X)*.

The result of these comparisons is very clearcut. The active Scottish drunk charged with an offence is much more likely than his counterpart in E/W(X) to be rated as neither incapable nor incoherent. This tendency can be explained in terms either of a different pattern of behaviour in the two areas, or of differences in the social acceptability of behaviour by those who are "obviously" (and hence relatively innocuously) drunk, reflected in police practice, or both.

The facts presented in the next sub-section tend, in the present writer's opinion, to support the latter interpretation.

(iii) *The Nature of aggravating behaviour (detail).* Table S5 shows in detail the acts reported of those showing any aggravating behaviour in each area. As in the corresponding table for England and Wales (Table 12) two figures are given alongside each behaviour group. The first shows the sum of the percentages for all acts in each category, and the second (bracketted) figure is the figure obtained when multiple counting within category is eliminated.

TABLE S5 (E/W12)
Acts reported of offenders showing any
aggravating behaviour: detail analysis

Behaviour	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
1. <i>Physical Violence</i>		
i Fighting amongst own group	19.1	10.9
ii Fighting, attacks on strangers	7.5	5.9
iii Resisting attempt by management to eject or refuse entry	30.9	25.9
iv Other behaviour involving violence to people	2.8 (29.4)	8.6 (24.0)
	1.5	0.5
2. <i>Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence</i>		
i Threatening behaviour own group	7.2	6.8
ii Threatening behaviour towards strangers	20.5 (13.3) (20.3)	18.1 (11.3) (17.9)
3. <i>General "public nuisance" behaviour</i>		
i Rowdiness or horseplay	4.3	25.3
ii Deliberate obstruction of footway	0.9	3.2
iii Deliberate obstruction of traffic	1.1 (7.5)	2.8 (34.8)
iv Pushing, jostling, bumping the public	1.9	8.3
4. <i>Insulting language or behaviour</i>		
i Unsolicited remarks to strangers	0.8	2.6
ii Insulting behaviour	3.2	5.2
iii Obscene language amongst own group	16.7	9.3
iv Obscene language directed at strangers	21.9 (51.6)	14.2 (46.8)
v Obscene or offensive language directed at police	17.3	26.3

*The exception ("Insulting behaviour", which is largely composed of obscene or insulting language) is not readily explained. Thirty-eight per cent of those charged with offences relating to insulting behaviour in Scotland, but 57% in England and Wales (X), were rated as neither incapable nor incoherent.

TABLE S5 (E/W12)—continued

Behaviour	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
5. <i>Sexual behaviour</i>		
i Accosting person of same sex	0.3	0.5
ii Accosting person of opposite sex	0.7	0.9
iii Other sexual behaviour	0.7 (1.6)	0.1 (1.4)
6. <i>Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)</i>		
i Attempt to resist arrest	1.7	5.1
ii Attempt to rescue someone else from arrest	0.4	1.7
iii Attack on police officer	2.6 (4.2)	4.0 (10.2)
7. <i>Petty theft and minor fraud</i>		
i Refusing or neglecting to pay bill or fare	1.5	1.1
ii Theft of "souvenirs"	0.2	0.9
iii Shoplifting	0.1	0.1
iv Pocket picking or other theft from person	0.1 (4.9)	* (1.8)
v Other theft from public place	3.1	0.2
8. <i>Damage to property</i>		
i Accidental damage to property	0.4	1.0
ii Deliberate damage to property	5.6	8.7
iii Other behaviour involving damage to property	0.6 (6.5)	0.3 (9.9)
9. <i>Neglecting children</i>		
i Leaving child unattended/drunken in charge of a child	0.4	0.3
10. <i>Behaviour involving Drugs</i>		
i Behaviour involving drugs	*	*
11. <i>Vomiting and Urinating</i>		
i Vomiting	1.7	3.5
ii Urinating, defecating	9.4 (11.0)	7.5 (10.5)
12. <i>Other behaviour</i>		
i Any other behaviour not listed	3.7	3.3
Number of Acts	34583	42198
Number of persons showing aggravating behaviour (bases for percentages)	22649	23429
Average number of different acts per person showing aggravating behaviour	1.53	1.80

*Less than 0.1%.

The outstanding difference between the two areas lies in the much smaller reported incidence of "general public nuisance behaviour" (3) in Scotland than in E/W(X). (7.5% compared with 34.8%).

This is the most innocuous form of behaviour among those listed, in that it offers no threat or insult to others, or even to those within the group exhibiting the behaviour.

Unless intoxicated persons in Scotland are much less prone to this type of behaviour than those in E/W(X), the only conclusion which can reasonably be drawn from this result is that the police in Scotland (assumedly acting in accordance with a lesser susceptibility of the public to noisy but innocuous behaviour) are

much less prone than those in E/W(X) to bring a charge against persons behaving in this way.

By comparison other differences are slight, namely—

(1) *Physical violence.* Fighting within the offenders own group, and to a lesser extent fighting and attacks on strangers are more often reported from Scotland than from E/W(X).

Attempts to resist managements attempting to eject or refuse entry to premises, on the other hand, are much less often reported from Scotland than from E/W(X).

(2) *Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence.* Marginally more often reported from Scotland than from E/W(X).

(4) *Insulting language or behaviour.* Insulting behaviour is less often reported from Scotland than from E/W(X), but obscene language both amongst the offenders own group and directed at strangers is appreciably more often reported from Scotland. On the other hand obscene or offensive language directed at the police is much often reported from E/W(X) than from Scotland.

The fact that the overall incidence of insulting language or behaviour is quite similar in the two areas conceals this difference in the nature of the component items, obscene language directed at people other than the police being much more commonly reported from Scotland than from E/W(X).

(5) *Sexual behaviour.* This is a rare form of behaviour among the intoxicated in either area. There may possibly be some significance, relating to the lesser degree of incapability reported in general from Scotland, in the somewhat greater number of reports of sexual behaviour other than accosting.

(6) *Obstructing the police.* Reported more than twice as frequently from E/W(X) than from Scotland. This difference coincides with the much greater incidence of obscene or offensive remarks directed at the police in E/W(X) than in Scotland. (See 4 above).

(7) *Petty theft and minor fraud.* Miscellaneous thefts from public places were reported of 3.1 of the drunks in Scotland, compared with 0.2 in E/W(X).

(8) *Damage to property.* Rather less frequently reported from Scotland than from E/W(X).

(9) *Neglecting children/drunk in charge of a child.* This was a very rare item in either area.

(10) *Behaviour involving drugs.* Reported in less than 0.1 % of cases in either area.

(11) *Vomiting and urinating.* There were more cases of urinating and fewer of vomiting reported from Scotland than from E/W(X). This appears to be consistent with the tendency for those charged in Scotland to be less often incapable than those charged in E/W(X).

The main difference between the areas is clearly the much smaller proportion of those charged in Scotland than in E/W(X) reported as exhibiting "general public nuisance" behaviour—the main component of which was described as

"rowdiness or horseplay". In general, it appears likely that there is a difference between Scotland and E/W(X) in the exercise of discretion on whether or not to arrest, the Scottish police being inclined to concentrate on those who present a real threat.

It does not seem credible that a difference of this magnitude can be attributed to a true difference in the incidence of rowdiness among drunks in the different countries, and we are left with the alternative explanation that in Scotland there is greater tolerance for mere rowdiness among drunks than there is in E/W(X).

If this is the case, differences described in the Tables on degree of incapacity begin to fall into place. If we were to assume that in Scotland there is greater tolerance than in E/W(X) for all acts by drunks who are sufficiently "under the influence" to manifest their drunkenness through a degree of incapacity or slurred speech, than for those who appear to be in better control of themselves (and consequently potentially more menacing), then the greater proportion of those charged in Scotland who were rated as neither incapable nor incoherent would be explained.

There is some support for this hypothesis in the fact that a greater proportion of those charged in Scotland than in E/W(X) are reported to have shown actual physical violence. Physical violence (both in Scotland and E/W(X)) is associated on average with the lowest degree of incapacity of any of the main acts ascribed to drunks; and "public nuisance" behaviour with the highest degree. In general, it appears likely that the inevitable selective process by which the police have to decide which of several eligible persons frequenting the same public place at certain times they shall apprehend or report for summons, operates somewhat differently in Scotland and in E/W(X), the Scottish police being more inclined to select those who present a real threat.

Given that there is a greater tolerance in Scotland for drunken rowdiness, it could well be the case that there is also a greater tolerance for other acts of drunks which appear comparatively unthreatening—namely acts of any sort by drunken persons who are to some extent incapacitated or manifest their state in heavily slurred speech. If this were the case, it would be the drunks who appeared to be in best control of their actions, the capable and coherent, who would tend to be the least tolerated (because best able to sustain threatening actions or carry out their expressed intentions).

(iv) **Behaviour (main types) and capability.** Table S6 is a summary of Table S5, showing the distribution of the main types of behaviour which we have already considered in detail in the two areas.

This table shows clearly the major difference in the incidence of "public nuisance" behaviour among those charged in each of the areas, respectively. It also shows the rather greater incidence of physical violence and of insulting language or behaviour in Scotland compared with E/W(X), and the markedly slighter incidence in Scotland of obstructing the police.

We have already noted that the difference in the incidence of insulting language and behaviour, which appears to be only slightly greater in Scotland than in E/W(X), is somewhat deceptive because one component—obscene, indecent or offensive language directed at the police—was much less frequently reported of offenders in Scotland than it was of those in E/W(X).

TABLE S6 (E/W13)
Behaviour of all those with aggravating behaviour reported against them*

C

Behaviour	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. Physical violence	% 29	% 24
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	20	18
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	8	35
4. Insulting language or behaviour	52	47
5. Sexual behaviour	2	1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	4	10
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	5	2
8. Damage to property	6	10
11. Urinating, vomiting etc.	11	11
9, 10, 12. Other behaviour	4	4
Base† (persons with aggravating behaviour)	22697	23429
Average number of different types of behaviour per person with aggravating behaviour	1.41	1.62

*Percentages add to over 100% because many people had more than one type of aggravating behaviour reported against them.

†The bases include all offenders with aggravating behaviour in contradistinction to later tables concerned with the aggravating behaviour of those facing specific types of charge.

Table S7 is an analysis of the component parts composing this general group, based on the total number of each item of each nature reported.

TABLE S7 (E/W14)
Insulting language and behaviour

H

Nature of insulting language and behaviour	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
Unsolicited, annoying, but inoffensive remarks to strangers	1	4
Insulting, derogatory etc., remarks to strangers	5	9
Obscene language amongst own group	28 } 65%	16 } 41%
Obscene language to strangers	37 }	25 }
Obscene, indecent or offensive language to police	29 }	46 }
Base (total number of items of insulting language and behaviour reported)	13566	13498

It will be seen that in Scotland 65% of all acts in this group consisted of obscene language amongst the offenders own group (28%) or directed to strangers (37%). The corresponding figures for E/W(X) are 41% of all acts, 16% occurring within the offenders own group and 25% directed to strangers. *Apart* from obscene language, offenders in Scotland were less often reported to have directed either inoffensive or offensive remarks to strangers (6% Scotland; 13% E/W(X)). Of the total items included in the category of "insulting language and behaviour" 29% were reported from Scotland, but 46% of those reported from E/W(X) consisted of obscene indecent or offensive language directed at the police.

In view of the very much lower incidence of "public nuisance" behaviour reported from Scotland than from E/W(X), an analysis of the components of this general group in each area is given in Table S8 (E/W15).

TABLE S8 (E/W15)
"Public nuisance" behaviour

Behaviour	Scotland	E/W(X)
Rowdiness and horseplay	53	64
Deliberate obstruction of footway	11	8
Deliberate obstruction of roadway	13	7
Pushing, jostling, bumping into members of public	23	21
	47%	36%
Base (total number of items of "public nuisance" behaviour)	1849	9288

Not only were there many fewer items of "public nuisance" behaviour reported from Scotland than from England and Wales, but a higher proportion of these items in Scotland (47%) than in E/W(X) (36%) involved definite inconvenience, as distinct from possible annoyance, to the public.

* * * * *

It will be recalled that a measure of the average degree of incapacity of offenders showing different sorts of behaviour was derived from assigning the following weights to the ratings given by the police:

	Weight
Total or near-total incapability	1
Partial incapability	2
Incoherent but not incapable	3
Neither incapable nor incoherent	4

Table S9 compares the "mean capability scores" calculated in this way for each of the main types of behaviour in the two areas.

TABLE S9 (E/W16)
Average degree of capability of offenders exhibiting each type of behaviour

Rank order (starts with least capable) Sc. E/W	Behaviour	Mean capability score		Bases	
		Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. 1.	Urinating, vomiting etc.	3.04	2.13	2496	2470
2. 2.	General "public nuisance" behaviour	3.17	2.68	1706	8144
3. 4.	Insulting language or behaviour	3.41	2.85	11711	10958
4. 5.	Damage to property	3.43	2.92	1468	2322
5. 6.	Sexual behaviour	3.44	2.95	362	334
6. 8.	Obstructing the police (excl. verbal insult etc.)	3.46	3.11	954	2392
7. 3.	Petty theft and minor fraud	3.49	2.76	1112	431
8. 7.	Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	3.50	3.02	4608	4197
9. 9.	Physical violence	3.56	3.12	6673	5634

The mean capability score for those acting in each of the nine ways described in the Table was higher in Scotland than in E/W(X)—i.e. on average, whatever their behaviour, alleged offenders in Scotland tended to be rated as more capable than their counterparts in E/W(X).

The two types of behaviour associated with the lowest mean degree of capability were the same in both areas—namely urinating and vomiting, and “general public nuisance” behaviour. Similarly the two types of behaviour associated with the highest mean capability score (representing those tending to be the most capable) were physical violence, and threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence.

The rank order of all the different types of behaviour in the two areas, in relation to the mean capability score of those behaving in these ways differed appreciably in respect of “petty theft and minor fraud”, which was associated with a comparatively high score (rank order 3) in E/W(X) and a comparatively low one (rank order 7) in Scotland. The reason for this difference is probably the difference in the component items in the two areas. In E/W(X) the majority in this group were reported to have refused or neglected to pay fares or bills, or to have stolen “souvenirs”; while in Scotland the majority had carried out miscellaneous thefts from public places—an activity more likely to require some capacity for forethought and co-ordination.

“Obstructing the police” also showed a higher ranking in relation to mean capability score in Scotland (rank order 6) than it is in E/W(X) (rank order 8). (i.e. those drunks said to have obstructed the police in Scotland tended to be less capable than their counterparts in E/W(X)). Here again, the difference between areas in the component parts of this group of activities probably accounts for the difference. In E/W(X) considerably more than half of these activities related to attempts to resist arrest or to “rescue” others from arrest; in Scotland rather more than half of the acts concerned were attacks on police officers unrelated to the offender’s arrest or to anyone else’s.

(v) Behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace only (Sc.) or of aggravated drunkenness only [E/W(X)]

Table S10 shows the behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace only in Scotland, and with charges of aggravated drunkenness only in E/W(X). The bracketted figures are transcribed from Table S6 and show the behaviour of *all* those with aggravating behaviour reported against them, irrespective of charge.

The following types of behaviour, in *both* areas, were much more common among all those showing any kind of aggravating behaviour than they were among those facing only the single charge of breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness:

6. Obstructing the police
8. Damage to property

In both cases the contrast was greater in Scotland than it was in E/W(X). A drunk who obstructs the police or damages property in Scotland is much less likely to be charged only with a breach of the peace than his counterpart in E/W(X) is to be charged only with aggravated drunkenness. The implication is that these forms of behaviour are quite often concealed in charges of aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X) but very rarely in charges of breach of the peace in Scotland.

Table S10 (E/W17)
Behaviour of those charged with breach of the peace only (Sc.)
or Drunkenness with Aggravations only [E/W(X)]

Type of behaviour	Proportion of persons charged with Breach of the peace only (Sc.) and Drunkenness with Aggravations only (E & W) who behaved in this way	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. Physical violence	$\frac{26}{26}$ (29)	$\frac{22}{22}$ (24)
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	$\frac{28}{28}$ (20)	$\frac{18}{18}$ (18)
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	$\frac{9}{9}$ (8)	$\frac{38}{38}$ (35)
4. Insulting language or behaviour	$\frac{69}{69}$ (52)	$\frac{48}{48}$ (47)
5. Sexual behaviour	$\frac{*}{*}$ (2)	$\frac{1}{1}$ (1)
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	$\frac{1}{1}$ (4)	$\frac{5}{5}$ (10)
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	$\frac{1}{1}$ (5)	$\frac{1}{1}$ (2)
8. Damage to property	$\frac{1}{1}$ (6)	$\frac{2}{2}$ (10)
12. Vomiting, urinating, etc.	$\frac{1}{1}$ (11)	$\frac{8}{8}$ (11)
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	$\frac{2}{2}$ (4)	$\frac{2}{2}$ (4)
Base (those charged with breach of the peace only (Sc.) and Drunkenness with aggravations only [E & W(X)])	13375	16832
Average number of different types of behaviour per person charged with breach of the peace (Sc.) and aggravated Drunkenness E/W(X)	1.38	1.45

*Less than 0.5%.

This does not, of course, indicate that the behaviour is overlooked in considering a case or determining the sentence (in either area) but it suggests that a drunks criminal record may appear, when summarised, to be more serious in Scotland than that of a drunk who has behaved in similar ways in E/W(X). The difference probably relates to a general prosecution tendency in Scotland to relate charges against drunks directly to their behaviour, the offender's drunkenness being treated as a secondary consideration. In E/W(X) drunkenness is more often part of or the primary consideration in formulating the charge, and relatively serious kinds of behaviour by a drunk may not be apparent from the charge.

The following types of behaviour were each very infrequently recorded of drunks charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland. In E/W(X), too, they were much less frequently recorded of those charged with aggravated drunkenness only than they were amongst all types of aggravating behaviour reported, but the contrast was less marked than it was in Scotland:

- 7. Petty theft and minor fraud
- 12. Vomiting, urinating etc.

Clearly petty theft* cannot itself suitably be charged simply as a breach of the peace, and the difference between areas in relation to item 7 may be another reflexion of difference in the policy of formulating charges. But reference to

*Note: That category 7 includes what are technically instances of minor fraud (refusing or neglecting to pay bills or fares while drunk). It seems quite probable that a drunk making a great nuisance of himself over not paying a small fare might suitably be charged only with a breach of the peace.

Table S5 shows a rather marked difference between areas in the character of the behaviour reported. In E/W(X), though all forms of petty theft and fraud were less often reported, theft of "souvenirs" was more often reported of drunks than it was in Scotland (0.9% and 0.2%), whereas miscellaneous thefts from public places were much often reported of Scottish (3.1%) than of E/W(X) drunks (0.2%).

"Miscellaneous thefts" exclude shoplifting, pocket-picking, thefts from the person, and thefts of objects regarded by the police as souvenirs. Their nature has not been further analysed, but it is possible that they were of a less trivial kind than those described in detail.* This is purely speculative, but the possibility is worth mentioning since it would make it particularly unlikely in Scotland that petty theft would be glossed over in a minor charge directly related to some other aspect of the drunk's behaviour.

Vomiting, urinating etc. by drunks, though equally prevalent in both areas, was very rarely included in the behaviour of those charged with a breach of the peace only in Scotland (1%), but in E/W(X) it was quite often included in the behaviour of those charged with aggravated drunkenness only (8%).

Sexual behaviour, though infrequently reported of drunks in either area, was very rarely included in the activities of those charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland (less than 0.5%, compared with 2% of all those showing aggravating behaviour). Though only about half as frequently reported of all drunks in E/W(X), it featured about twice as frequently among those with only an aggravated drunkenness charged against them as it did among those with a breach of the peace charge against them in Scotland. It will be recalled that behaviour reported under this heading consisted largely of drunks accosting people.

In our discussion of Table S1 we suggested that an appreciable number of the 17% of drunks in Scotland who were charged neither with an offence of drunkenness nor with one of breach of the peace might well have been behaving in a way which would have led to a drunkenness charge in E/W(X). The above results, by inference, partially substantiate this suggestion. The single charge of breach of the peace in Scotland is principally used against drunks when their behaviour includes *nothing except* acts which the phrase "breach of the peace" implies. The single charge of drunkenness with aggravations in E/W(X) is quite frequently used against drunks whose behaviour includes acts (some of them more serious than a breach of the peace) which by their nature could not appropriately be charged as breaches of the peace.

We conclude that differences between areas in formulating the appropriate charge, contribute substantially to differences in the incidence of other charges besides those of breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness, which might appear superficially to indicate differing behaviour. The ratio between those charged with simple drunkenness and those drunks charged with other offences is very similar in both areas. In Scotland the charge against drunks other than those who are incapable is usually formulated in accordance with their behaviour—drunkenness is not mentioned in the charge, but the offender is charged in a

*Pocket-picking and thefts from the person by drunks may for practical purposes be ignored since they were reported of only 0.1% of those showing aggravating behaviour in Scotland and of even fewer in E/W(X). Shoplifting, too, was rarely reported (0.1% in both areas). These categories were included as being of special interest in relation to those forms of theft, and not because pilot work suggested they would be at all frequently found.

manner which would be equally appropriate in the case of a sober person behaving in the same way. In E/W(X) drunkenness is usually mentioned in the charge, and other behaviour, which in Scotland would probably lead to a charge other than one of drunkenness or breach of the peace, is not infrequently covered by the single charge of aggravated drunkenness.

(vi) Aggravating behaviour amongst those charged with simple drunkenness only.

Table S11 compares the incidence in the two areas of aggravating behaviour amongst those charged only with the offence of simple drunkenness (drunk and incapable):

TABLE S11 (E/W18)
Aggravating behaviour amongst those charged with simple drunkenness only

Aggravating behaviour	Incidence of each type of behaviour amongst those charged with simple drunkenness only	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. Physical violence	% 0.1	% 0.4
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	0.1	0.3
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	1.0	1.9
4. Insulting language or behaviour	0.7	2.1
5. Sexual behaviour	*	0.1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	*	0.1
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	*	0.1
8. Damage to property	0.1	0.4
12. Urinating, vomiting etc.	2.5	6.1
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	0.1	0.3
Base (all those charged with simple drunkenness only)	13969	12430

*Less than 0.05%

In Scotland, charges of simple drunkenness only were made even less frequently than they were in E/W(X) against drunks who had shown any form of aggravating behaviour. This is true for every single one of the ten items listed in the Table.

The trend is in accordance with the general practice in Scotland of fitting the charge strictly to the behaviour of the alleged offender. With very few exceptions the simple drunkenness offender in Scotland is a person whose *sole* manifestation of drunkenness is his incapability.

(vii) Behaviour associated with charges other than breach of the peace or drunkenness

Table S12 compares the incidence of each type of behaviour amongst people charged in each of the following ways, which will later be referred to in the abbreviated form given in brackets:

1. The first column for each area refers to those charged with a breach of the peace or an aggravated drunkenness offence *and* with one or more other offence(s) at the same time ("multiple charges")

2. The second column refers to those charged only with an offence or offences other than breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness ("other charges only")
3. The third column refers to those charged only with a breach of the peace or an aggravated drunkenness offence. This column repeats, in order to make back-reference unnecessary, the data already presented in Table S10 ("breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness charge only")

TABLE S12 (E/W19)

The behaviour of those intoxicated persons charged respectively with breach of the peace and another offence; another offence only; with breach of the peace only (Se.) or Drunkenness only (E & W); Non-drunkenness offence only; and aggravated drunkenness only (E & W).

Behaviour	Scotland			E/W(X)		
	Breach of the peace etc., and another offence	Other offence(s) only	Breach of the peace only	Drunkenness and another offence	Non-Drunkenness offence only	Aggravated drunkenness only
1. Physical violence	53	30	26	37	26	22
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	26	3	28	21	15	18
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	8	2	9	31	21	38
4. Insulting language or behaviour	69	10	69	52	38	48
5. Sexual behaviour	2	4	*	2	2	1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	25	4	1	32	23	5
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	3	15	1	4	5	1
8. Damage to property	28	10	1	42	15	2
12. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	4	32	1	5	9	8
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	12	5	2	12	6	2
Bases (number of persons)	2668	6090	13375	4272	1003	16832
Average number of different types of behaviour per person	2.30	1.15	1.38	2.40	1.58	1.45

*Less than 0.5%

Reference to Table S6 shows that the overall incidence of the following types of behaviour did not differ much between the two areas; but that their incidence in the two areas amongst the groups that we are comparing differed markedly:

1. *Physical violence.* This was reported of a much higher proportion (53%) of those facing multiple charges in Scotland than of the corresponding group in E/W(X) (37%). Among those charged in other ways, the incidence of this type of behaviour was only marginally greater in Scotland than in E/W(X).
2. *Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence.* Reported of a much higher proportion of those charged only with a breach of the peace in Scotland (28%) than of those charged with an aggravated drunkenness offence in E/W(X) (18%).
This type of behaviour was rarely reported of those charged with "other offences only" in Scotland (3%) but quite frequently (15%) of the corresponding group in E/W(X).
Amongst those facing multiple charges, there was only a marginal difference between areas in the incidence of this behaviour.
4. *Insulting language or behaviour.* Reported of a much higher proportion of those charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland (69%) than of those charged only with aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X) (48%).
This type of behaviour was comparatively rarely reported of those charged with other offences only in Scotland (10%), but frequently of the corresponding group in E/W(X) (38%). It was somewhat more often reported of those facing multiple charges in Scotland (69%) than in E/W(X) (52%).
12. *Vomiting, urinating etc.* In Scotland 32% of those charged with "other offences only" had vomited or urinated, but only 6% of the corresponding group in E/W(X). This behaviour was very rarely associated with a charge of breach of the peace only in Scotland (1%) but much more often with one of aggravated drunkenness only in E/W(X) (8%).

The incidence of most other forms of behaviour differed quite markedly between areas, but certain contrasts in the associated charges are noteworthy:

6. *Obstructing the Police.* In both areas this was most frequently reported of those facing multiple charges (25% Sc; 32% E/W(X)). But in Scotland only 4% of persons charged with "other offences only" were reported as having obstructed the police, compared with 23% of the corresponding group in E/W(X).
Similarly, in Scotland it was very rare for anyone who had obstructed the police to be charged with breach of the peace only (1%), but considerably more common among those charged with aggravated drunkenness only in E/W(X) (5%).
7. *Petty theft and minor fraud.* This behaviour was much more often reported of those with "other offences only" in Scotland than it was in E/W(X) (5%). There was little or no difference between areas in the proportions reported to be behaved in this way in respect of the other two types of charge; it was very infrequently reported of those charged with breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness only.
8. *Damage to Property.* Reported of 28% of multiple offenders in Scotland, 42% in E/W(X), and with 10-15% of "other offence(s) only" in both areas. Rarely in either area was damage to property reported of those charged with breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness only.

The incidence of other forms of behaviour by drunks was either so low (5. Sexual behaviour) or differed so greatly between area (3. Public nuisance behaviour) that little can be inferred from the comparative results in the present context.

The pattern emerging from these comparisons is a complex one, though it is clearly consistent with other data which suggest that different criteria tend to be used in Scotland from those used in E/W(X) in determining what charges shall be made against drunken offenders. In particular:

- i *Multiple charges.* The greater likelihood in Scotland than in E/W(X) that an offender faced with multiple charges will have physical violence reported against him may well reflect little more than a tendency in Scotland to formulate charges against drunks according to their behaviour rather than their drunkenness.

There is no support in any data we have presented yet for any suggestion that drunks using physical violence in Scotland are more violent than their counterparts in E/W(X) and Table S5 has shown that the greater part of this behaviour in Scotland consists of physical violence within the offender's own group. The slightly higher overall incidence of this behaviour is mainly accounted for by the higher proportion whose attacks are confined to their own group.

Here we anticipate later confirmatory data, in emphasising that the criteria given to the police in Scotland does not preclude the inclusion of offences by drunks which took place on private premises. (Offences of *drunkenness* are almost exclusively confined, by legal definition, to actions taking place in public places and the brief given to the police in E/W(X) centred—as that given to those in Scotland could not—on such offences). The Scottish brief is broad enough to allow for such items as attacks by drunks on spouse or relative in the home, which cannot be charged as offences of drunkenness, but can be charged as breaches of the peace (with or without further charges).

- ii *Non-violent inter-personal behaviour.* It will be noticed the principle forms of verbal behaviour reported (threatening, aggressive, insulting) were more common among those charged with a breach of the peace only in Scotland than they were among those charged with an offence of aggravated drunkenness only in E/W(X). But they were much less common amongst those charged with "other offences only" in Scotland than in E/W(X).

These trends suggest that a sole charge of breach of the peace in Scotland may cover a wider range of verbal behaviour than would be adequately covered by a sole charge of aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X).

- iii *Other behaviour.* In Scotland more than in E/W(X) certain types of behaviour tend not to be reported of those charged with a breach of the peace or a drunkenness offence (whether alone or in conjunction with another charge), but with a different charge or charges only.

The principal items illustrating this trend are vomiting and urinating and petty theft or minor fraud.

This tendency probably reflects in part the difference between areas in formulating the appropriate charge, again. This point will be discussed again later in conjunction with further data.

In general it appears likely that a tendency in Scotland to charge drunks more strictly in relation to their behaviour than is the case in E/W(X) accounts to a considerable extent for the much greater proportion of all charges in Scotland which are neither ones of breach of the peace or drunkenness. Furthermore there are, of course, certain forms of behaviour which cannot appropriately in themselves be charged as breaches of the peace.

In Scotland the charge of aggravated drunkenness is rarely used. A considerable part of the behaviour of drunks which might be assimilated in such a charge is assimilated under a charge of breach of the peace in Scotland. But breach of the peace is not an appropriate charge in many cases; consequently the variety of charges used in Scotland against drunks is wider than it is in E/W(X).

(viii) Proportion of each type of behaviour associated with charges of breach of the peace or drunkenness only (detailed behaviour)

In the previous Table (S12) we considered the behavioural make-up of those facing each of three charges-types or mixtures of charges, looking particularly at behavioural differences between area within comparable groups.

In the next Table (S13) we consider each form of behaviour in detail, showing in what proportion of cases the behaviour was associated:

- i in Scotland with a charge of breach of the peace only, and with any other offence or offences (whether or not a breach of the peace was included)
- ii in E/W(X) with an offence of drunkenness only, and with any other offence or offences (whether or not an offence of drunkenness was included)

It should be noted that Table S12 and S13 are not intercomparable, since one presents the main acts of those in each charge group (percentaged vertically and based on the numbers in each charge-group), and the other presents (percentaged horizontally and based on the numbers reported as behaving in each way) the broad charges, in the two groups described above, brought against those behaving in this way.

It must also be borne in mind that more than one type of behaviour may be reported of any one person. Table S13 shows the charges associated with each type of behaviour, and we have no means of ascertaining which particular item of behaviour led directly either to a decision to charge at all, or to the formulation of the charge itself. In many cases it is likely that the behaviour reported represents a sequence of different types of behaviour over time—for example, it is impossible for a person to resist arrest until he has already done something which leads the officer concerned to try to arrest him. The fact that some forms of behaviour which we should not expect in themselves to lead to any charge other than one of drunkenness or breach of the peace are actually quite often associated with other charges (i.e. are included as part of the behaviour of the offender) is accounted for in this way.

The main fact shown by this Table is a very simple one: *every single form of behaviour except one* is less likely to be associated with a charge of breach of the peace only in Scotland than the corresponding form of behaviour is to be associated with a charge of drunkenness only in E/W(X).*

*i.e. "no aggravating behaviour"

TABLE S13 (E/W20)

Behaviour associated with (A) Drunkenness charges only (E & W); and charges of breach of the peace or drunkenness only (Sc.)

(B) Other charges only.

Behaviour	Total number of times reported		Percentage of total which refer to:—			
			Breach of the peace only (Sc.) or drunkenness only (E/W(X))		Other charges	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
No aggravating behaviour	13462	11601	100%	100%	0%	0%
1. <i>Physical violence</i>						
Fighting or physical violence confined to own group	4316	2565	63%	88%	37%	12%
Fighting, physical violence, or attack on strangers	1691	1389	22%	74%	78%	26%
Resisting attempt by management to eject, refuse entry to pub, club, dance hall or any premises other than private dwelling	630	2017	60%	78%	40%	22%
Other behaviour involving violence to people (other than attacks on police)	347	110	8%	37%	92%	63%
2. <i>Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence)</i>						
Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence) confined to own group	1634	1593	82%	93%	18%	7%
Threatening or aggressive behaviour (without violence) to stranger(s)	3012	2649	82%	92%	18%	8%
3. <i>General "public nuisance" behaviour</i>						
Rowdiness or horseplay	976	5939	78%	96%	22%	4%
Deliberate obstruction of footway	205	744	88%	94%	12%	6%
Deliberate obstruction of traffic	243	657	85%	97%	15%	3%
Pushing, jostling, bumping into members of the public	425	1948	83%	97%	17%	3%
4. <i>Insulting language or behaviour</i>						
Unsolicited remarks to strangers	184	603	74%	94%	26%	6%
Insulting behaviour	735	1229	79%	92%	21%	8%
Obscene language—own group	3779	2171	80%	90%	20%	10%
Obscene language—strangers	4951	3322	83%	91%	17%	9%
Obscene, indecent or offensive language directed at police	3917	6173	79%	92%	21%	8%
5. <i>Sexual behaviour</i>						
Accosting person of same sex	66	117	29%	85%	71%	15%
Accosting person of opposite sex	153	202	21%	90%	79%	10%
Indecent act—same sex	(17)	(4)	(0%)	(75%)	(100%)	(25%)
Indecent act—opposite sex	38	(9)	0%	(67%)	100%	(33%)
Indecent exposure	77	(12)	9%	(58%)	91%	(42%)
Other behaviour involving sex	33	(3)	21%	(100%)	79%	(0%)

TABLE S13 (E/W20)—continued

Behaviour	Total number of times reported		Percentage of total which refer to:—			
			Breach of the peace only (Se.) or drunkenness only (E/W(X))		Other charges	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
6. <i>Obstructing the police</i>						
Attempt to resist arrest	388	1193	13%	67%	87%	33%
Attempt to rescue someone else from arrest	99	400	13%	40%	87%	60%
Other attack on police officer	589	944	4%	9%	96%	91%
7. <i>Petty theft and minor fraud</i>						
Refusing or neglecting to pay bill, fare, etc.	330	251	22%	82%	78%	18%
Theft of "souvenirs", ashtrays, glasses, etc.	35	50	14%	12%	86%	88%
Shoplifting (incl. from street barrows, etc.)	34	(17)	0%	(18)%	100%	(82)%
Pocket picking or other theft from person	(14)	(1)	0%	(0)%	100%	(100)%
Other theft from public place	143	62	1%	3%	99%	97%
Other behaviour involving stealing	560	60	1%	10%	99%	90%
8. <i>Damage to property</i>						
Accidental damage to property	99	224	64%	67%	36%	33%
Deliberate damage to property	1267	2030	6%	11%	94%	89%
Other behaviour involving damage to property	138	70	5%	44%	95%	56%
9. <i>Neglecting children</i>						
Drunk in charge of a child	89	60	94%	90%	6%	10%
Neglect of children; leaving children unattended	(6)	(4)	(33)%	(100)%	(67)%	(0)%
10. <i>Behaviour involving drugs</i>	(6)	(6)	(17)%	(50)%	(83)%	(50)%
11. <i>Urinating and vomiting</i>						
Urinating, defecating	2138	1759	7%	91%	93%	9%
Vomiting	382	811	84%	98%	16%	2%
12. <i>Any other behaviour not listed</i>	837	780	25%	42%	75%	58%
Total	48045	53801	71%	86%	29%	14%

N.B. Bracketted figures based on a total of less than 25 cases. Percentages are given to illustrate the consistency with which persons showing some of the rarer types of behaviour are charged.

Note: In this Table the four drunks charged in E/W(X) with breach of the peace have been included among those facing "other charges".

This result is not very surprising when we consider the restricted applicability of the breach of the peace charge by comparison with the aggravated drunkenness charge. The Table does, however, indicate conclusively that (apart from simple drunkenness) a direct comparison of the distribution of charges in the two areas will be very difficult to evaluate in terms of behavioural differences.

The evaluation of the present results must depend upon an evaluation of the relative seriousness of different charges, which it is not within the scope of this inquiry to attempt.

It is, however, worth noting, for the reader's evaluation, which are the more extreme contrasts between the two areas. Listed below are those forms of behaviour which were at the same time associated in more than 70% of cases in Scotland with an offence or offences other than breach of the peace alone, and in E/W(X) were associated in more than 70% of cases with offence of *drunkenness* alone:

- Fighting, physical violence or attack on stranger(s)
- Accosting persons (of the same or of opposite sex)
(Note: a rather similar trend was found in relation to indecent acts, but the numbers in E/W(X) are far too small for any reliance to be placed on these results)
- Attempts to resist arrest
- Refusing or neglecting to pay bills etc.
- Urinating, defecating (NOT vomiting, which was in the great majority of cases in both areas was associated with a charge of breach of the peace or drunkenness alone.)

(ix) Charges made against drunks other than charges of drunkenness or breach of the peace

Table S14 shows the incidence of charges other than ones of drunkenness or breach of the peace which were brought against drunks in the two areas. It is based on the whole of the samples (including simple drunkenness offenders) and includes all charges made against 0.1 or more of offenders in Scotland.

The corresponding Table for E/W(X) included only those offences with which 0.5% or more of all offenders were charged either in the MPD, E/W(X), or both. The present Table is confined to offences with which more than 0.1% were charged in Scotland, omitting breach of the peace. This extension was necessary not only because there were a considerable number of offences with which 0.5% or more were charged in Scotland, but fewer than 0.5% in E/W(X); but also because there was one charge which qualified for inclusion in the E/W(X) table, but not in the Scottish.

The following Table therefore includes many offences not mentioned in the corresponding Table for E/W(X).

Certain charges against drunks were more common in E/W(X) than in Scotland. These included charges of assault on the police, and certain miscellaneous assault charges but the rest tended to be relatively minor ones. The higher incidence of charges of assault against the police in E/W(X) than in Scotland is probably accounted for by the markedly higher incidence of all types of behaviour which might lead to such a charge in E/W(X) (c.f. Table S5). (For the same reason, probably, charges of obstructing the police were more common in E/W(X) than in Scotland).

The rather greater prevalence of miscellaneous wounding and assault charges in E/W(X) than in Scotland cannot readily be explained. These exclude indecent assault, assaults on the police, spouse or relative, and other charges of common assault.

TABLE S14 (E/W21 modified)

Charges other than drunkenness or breach of the peace made against 0.1% or more of the alleged offenders

Charge	Proportions charged in this way	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
5. Indecent assault	0.1	*
6. Assault on police	1.8	3.2
7. Assault on spouse or relative	4.0	0.1
8. Other common assault	4.1	0.1
9. Any other wounding or assault charge	0.3	0.8
10. Possessing offensive weapon	0.7	0.5
11. Disorderly or unruly behaviour	0.7	2.0
12. Any other charge relating to violence	*	0.2
13. Any other charge relating to disorderliness	0.1	0.2
14. Refusal to quit licensed premises	0.2	1.0
15. Malicious or wilful damage	2.0	5.2
16. Malicious mischief	1.0	*
17. Other charge of damage to property	*	0.1
18. Breaking or attempted breaking	0.8	*
19. Shoplifting	0.1	*
20. Theft or attempted theft from motor vehicle	0.5	*
21. Theft of "souvenirs"	0.1	0.1
22. Other theft without breaking	0.6	0.2
23. Theft from person	0.1	*
24. Failure to pay fare, bill etc.	0.7	0.1
25. Urinating, vomiting or defecating	5.6	0.4
26. Gross indecency	0.2	*
27. Indecent or obscene language	0.5	1.2
28. Obstructing police	0.2	0.6
29. Resisting arrest	0.7	0.1
30. Insulting/Threatening words/behaviour	0.1	0.5
31. Buying/consuming liquor under age	0.1	0.3
32. Charge not listed	0.5	0.3
Base (all persons charged)	36111	34642

*Less than 0.1% (incl. none).

The remaining charges found more often in E/W(X) than in Scotland were those implying or described as:

- Disorderly or unruly behaviour
- Refusal to quit licensed premises
- Malicious or wilful damage
- Indecent or obscene language

(This list excludes marginal differences where the incidence in both areas was less than 0.5%).

The charges more often made against drunks in Scotland than in E/W(X) were as follows. (The percentages in the two areas are quoted because some charges were *much* more common in Scotland than in E/W(X) and others very uncommon or not found at all in E/W(X)). The latter are indicated by an asterisk:

Assault on spouse or relative (4.0% Sc. and 0.1% E/W(X))

Common assault other than on police, spouse or relative and excluding indecent assault (4.1% and 0.1%)

Note: Indecent assault reached the incidence level of 0.1% in Scotland, but not in E/W(X)

- Possessing offensive weapon (0.7% and 0.5%)
- Malicious mischief (1.0% and *)
- Breaking or attempted breaking (0.8% and *)
- Theft or attempted theft from motor vehicle (0.5% and *)
- Miscellaneous thefts without breaking (0.6% and 0.2%)
- Failure or refusal to pay bill, fare etc. (0.7% and 0.1%)
- Urinating, vomiting or defecating (5.6% and 0.4%)
- Gross indecency (0.2% and *)
- Resisting arrest (0.7% and 0.1%)

The most marked differences between the two areas relate to the much higher incidence in Scotland of a number of charges implying violence to the person; and of charges implying urination etc. by drunks in public places. Charges indicating theft or attempted theft of a number of kinds were also more common in Scotland than they were in E/W(X), certain of these charges (breaking; theft from motor vehicles) being never or practically never reported from E/W(X). Some other charges which were practically never made against drunks in E/W(X) were used in Scotland, (malicious mischief; gross indecency).

These differences might be partially explained by behavioural differences, but it seems at least as probable that they are largely an outcome of a different policy in formulating charges against drunks in Scotland, with the additional difference (applicable in particular to assaults on spouse or relative) that offences by drunks which took place in private places were admissible in the terms of the brief given to the Scottish police, but not in the terms given to the police in E/W(X).

III CHARACTERISTICS OF DRUNKEN OFFENDERS IN RELATION TO THEIR BEHAVIOUR AND OTHER VARIABLES

(i) Sex. Table S15 shows the proportions of alleged offenders in each area who were women, in total and in relation to each of the types of charge.

TABLE S15 (E/W/22)

Charges analysed by Sex

C

Charge	Percentage of those charged who were women			
	Scotland		E/W(X)	
	%	Base	%	Base
1. Simple drunkenness only	8	13970	7	12430
2. Breach of the peace etc. only	6	13382	4	16891
3. Breach of the peace etc. at the same time as another offence	3	2668	3	4272
7. Damage to property	4	1096	3	1855
12. Obstructing the police	2	906	3	1360
6. Disorderliness	7	368	5	1195
11. Indecent language	10	255	4	573
4. Assault	2	2988	2	337
8. Theft	5	1036	2	198
5. Possessing offensive weapon	*	263	1	150
9. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	1	2045	1	142
10, 13, 14. Other charges	11	346	3	212
All persons charged	6	36072	5	34597

There was little difference between areas in the proportion of all drunks charged who were women (6% Sc., 5% E/W(X)).

Scotland tended to have a marginally greater proportion of women amongst those facing most types of charge. But the only difference of any appreciable magnitude occurred among those charged with using indecent etc. language. In Scotland 10% of those facing this charge were women, compared with only 4% in E/W(X).

The next Table (S16) is a comparison between areas of the degree of incapacity reported of men and women respectively.

In both areas women drunks charged with an offence were more often reported than men as being totally incapable, or nearly so. The overall tendency for Scottish drunks to be, on average, less drunk was *not* reflected at all in the magnitude of the totally incapable group. Among male offenders in *both* areas 28%-29% were reported being totally incapable, compared with 39%-40% of women.

TABLE S16 (E/W23)
Sex, analysed by degree of incapacity

Degree of Incapacity	Men		Women	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
Totally or nearly totally incapable	28	29	39	40
Partially incapable	21	36	23	33
Incoherent only	11	9	11	7
None of the above	40	26	27	20
Bases	33850	32882	2145	1686

The outstanding difference between areas is the much greater proportion of male offenders in Scotland who were reported as showing neither incoherence (slurred speech etc.) nor any degree of incapability (40% of all men charged in Scotland; 26% in E/W(X)). In Scotland there were also substantially fewer (of either sex) than in E/W who were reported to be partially incapable. The proportions who were incoherent but not even partially incapable were comparatively small in both areas, but slightly greater among both sexes in Scotland than in E/W(X).

Table S17 shows the behaviour of men and women drunks respectively, in each area. (There is no equivalent Table in Part I of this report, showing the distribution of behaviour among the whole sample in E/W(X), though Table E/W 24 gives a similar analysis for the MPD).

TABLE S17 (NO E/W(X) EQUIVALENT)
Sex, analysed by behaviour

	Scotland		E/W(X)	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
13. No aggravating behaviour	37	51	33	44
1. Physical violence	19	9	16	12
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	13	9	12	7
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	5	4	24	17
4. Insulting language or behaviour	33	31	32	33
5. Sexual behaviour	1	2	1	1
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult, etc.)	3	1	7	5
7. Potty theft and minor fraud	3	2	1	1
8. Damage to property	4	3	7	5
12. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	7	2	7	4
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	2	4	2	3
Bases (number of persons)	33851	2145	32882	1686

Note: Percentages add to more than 100% since two or more different types of behaviour could be exhibited by any one person.

In both areas women offenders much more often than men showed no aggravating behaviour. In Scotland, among both sexes, however, the propor-

tions reported as showing no aggravating behaviour were higher than they were in E/W(X). This does not reflect a higher incidence of total incapability in Scotland, and is not readily explained. Women drunks charged in Scotland were substantially more likely to have shown no aggravating behaviour (51%) than were any other of the groups in either area (33-44%).

In relation to the incidence of the various other types of behaviour, the general trend is for the difference between men and women to run in the same direction as in E/W(X) but for the contrast sometimes to be a little more marked in Scotland. This is partly an outcome of the higher proportion of women charged in Scotland who showed no aggravating behaviour.

A more meaningful picture is perhaps presented if we take as our bases only those offenders who were reported as showing some form of aggravating behaviour. This is done in Table S18:

TABLE S18 (E/W25)

Behaviour of those showing any aggravating behaviour
Men and Women

Behaviour	Men		Women	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. Physical violence	30	25	18	22
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	20	19	18	13
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	8	36	8	30
4. Insulting language or behaviour	51	47	63	59
5. Sexual behaviour	2	1	3	2
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insult etc.)	4	11	2	9
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	5	2	5	1
8. Damage to property	7	10	5	9
12. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	11	11	4	7
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	4	4	9	5
Base (number of persons both aggravating behaviour)	21504	22037	1053	942

Among those offenders showing any form of aggravating behaviour, men in Scotland were much more likely to have used physical violence (30%) than were women (18%). A similar contrast, but a very much less marked one, between the sexes, was found in E/W(X).

Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence was displayed by similar proportions of men as of women in Scotland (20% and 18%), but in E/W(X) there was an appreciable tendency for this type of behaviour to be more common among males (19% and 13%).

Insulting language or behaviour was more common in both areas among the women than the men who showed any form of aggravating behaviour. It was reported of a majority of three of the four groups considered, the only exception being men in E/W(X) (47%). Nearly two thirds of women in Scotland (63%) who showed any aggravating behaviour behaved insultingly.

(ii) Age. The age-distribution of alleged offenders in the two areas is shown in Table S19.

TABLE S19 (E/W26)

Age distribution of persons charged

H

Age-group	Scotland	E/W(X)
13-17	% 4	% 4
18-19	9	12
20-24	18	18
25-29	13	12
30-39	21	19
40-49	17	18
50-59	11	11
60-69	5	4
70 and over	1	1
No information	1	1
Bases	36111	34642

*Less than 0.5%

The distribution by age of drunks in Scotland and in E/W(X) was closely similar, all along the age scale.

The under-25's. An analysis for each year of age from 18 to 24 was given in the English section of this report. Table S20 compares the two areas in respect of these ages:

TABLE S20 (E/W27)

Distribution of offenders aged 18 to 24

H

	Proportion of all offenders who were this age:	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
18	% 5.0	% 6.3
19	4.5	5.4
20	3.8	4.4
21	3.9	4.3
22	3.6	3.7
23	3.3	3.0
24	3.1	2.8
Base (all offenders)	36111	34642
% of all offenders who were aged between 18 and 24	27.2	29.9

The differences between the two areas were again marginal.

Age and degree of incapacity. It will be recalled (*see Table S2*) that the proportion of drunks rated as totally or nearly totally incapable differed little between the two areas, but many fewer in Scotland than in E/W(X) were rated as only partially incapable, and many more as neither incapable nor incoherent. Table S21 compares the degree of incapacity of persons in each age-group in the areas:

TABLE S21 (E/W28)
Age by degree of incapacity

Age Group		Total and near-total incapacity	Partial incapacity	Incoherent only		Neither incapable nor incoherent		Bases (Number of persons of this age)
13-17	Scotland	18	17	10		55		1375
	E/W(X)	19	32	11	11	39		1436
18-19	Scotland	12	17	11		60		3415
	E/W(X)	11	35	11	11	43		4036
20-24	Scotland	14	20	12		54		6368
	E/W(X)	14	36	11	11	39		6341
25-29	Scotland	19	21	11		48		4855
	E/W(X)	21	37	10	10	32		4108
30-39	Scotland	27	22	12		38		7514
	E/W(X)	31	39	8		22		6470
40-49	Scotland	37	24	11		28		6237
	E/W(X)	40	38	7		15		6359
50-59	Scotland	48	24	9		19		3898
	E/W(X)	48	35	6		11		3709
60-69	Scotland	60	21	8		11		1733
	E/W(X)	59	30	4		7		1403
70 & over	Scotland	71	18	6		5		395
	E/W(X)	74	20	3		3		388
No information on age	Scotland	60	14	7		18		191
	E/W(X)	44	31	7		17		347
Totals	Scotland	28	21	11		40		36072
	E/W(X)	29	36	9		26		34597

Within each of the nine age groups, closely similar proportions in each area were rated as totally incapable.

In every age group in Scotland between 17% and 24% were rated as partially incapable, compared with 30-39% in all groups except the oldest—aged 70 and over—in E/W(X) (20%).

It does not appear that the lesser average degree of incapacity of drunks in Scotland is attributable to the idiosyncrasies of any particular age-group. These results simply suggest that, when they are not "flat-out", drunks of all ages charged with an offence in Scotland are less likely than those in E/W(X) to manifest their drunkenness in partial incapacity. This might indicate a greater capacity among Scotsmen to "hold their drink", in the popular sense of not showing gross physical manifestations of drunkenness when their behaviour in other respects has been affected.

Charges and Age. Table S22 is an analysis of the charges in each area by the age of the offenders.

TABLE 522 (E/W30)
Charges by Age (E/W(X) data expanded for comparison)

Age Group	Simple Drunk- ness	B of JWS Aggravated Dr (E/W)	B of JWS Ag Dr (E/W) with another offense	Damage to Property	Obstructing the police	Disorderly conduct	Indecent language	Assault	Theft	Possession offensive weapons	Unlawful Use of Force etc.	Other Charges
13-17 Sc E/W(X)	% 2	% 3	% 7	% 6	% 7	% 5	% 9	% 3	% 4	% 12	% 3	% 10
18-24 Sc E/W(X)	4	14	14	15	12	13	17	9	9	23	11	7
25-34 Sc E/W(X)	9	23	24	26	29	23	24	19	25	20	23	19
35-44 Sc E/W(X)	9	16	16	16	18	15	17	16	20	20	15	18
45-54 Sc E/W(X)	21	20	23	21	22	20	18	27	24	15	22	23
55-64 Sc E/W(X)	22	13	13	11	9	14	13	19	12	8	16	14
65-74 Sc E/W(X)	19	6	4	3	3	7	2	6	5	2	8	7
75-84 Sc E/W(X)	10	2	1	2	*	2	1	1	1	*	2	2
75 & over Sc E/W(X)	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1
Total	11970	13382	2668	1096	956	348	255	2948	1036	263	2045	346
	12430	16891	4272	1255	1360	1197	573	337	198	150	842	212

Charges and Age. A much higher proportion of all alleged offenders in Scotland were charged with offences other than those of drunkenness or breach of the peace than were charged with drunkenness offences in E/W(X). (See Table S1)

Table S22, which is an analysis of the age distribution of those charged with each type of offence in the two areas, disregards differences in the incidence of alleged offences, and indicates whether or not there were differences in the ages of those facing particular charges or combinations of charges. The third column of this Table considers all those charged with more than one offence, when the charges included either breach of the peace (Sc.) or aggravated drunkenness (E/W(X)). Subsequent columns include both those incorporated in the third column, and those charged only with offences specified in the column headings.

The age distributions of those facing charges of simple drunkenness, or of breach of the peace (Sc.) or aggravated drunkenness (E/W(X)) only, were closely similar in the two areas.

Multiple charges which included a charge either of breach of the peace or of aggravated drunkenness were rather more common in Scotland in the age-group 30-39 (23%) than they were in the corresponding group in E/W(X) (16%).

Among the specific charges, the distribution by age of alleged offenders in the two areas differed only slightly in respect of:

Damage to property

Disorderliness

Indecent language (there was some indication that younger people contribute less to this type of charge in Scotland than in E/W(X)).

Among the remaining charges the following differences are noteworthy:

Obstructing the police. In Scotland, many fewer of those facing this type of charge were in the age-groups 18-19 or 20-24 (total in both groups: 41%) than was the case in E/W(X) (54%). Considerably more in Scotland (22%) than in E/W(X) (13%) were in the 30-39 age-group.

Assault. These charges were much more commonly made against drunks in Scotland than in E/W(X). Of those charged with assault many fewer in Scotland than in E/W(X) came from each of the three youngest age-groups—the under 25's—and many more from each of the middle age-groups (30-39 and 40-49). The combined figures for the groups described were: youngest groups: Sc. 31%, E/W(X) 57%, and middle age-groups: Sc. 46%, E/W(X) 23%.

Theft. Differences between area were not very great, but there was some tendency for younger people (18-24) to figure less prominently among drunks accused of theft in Scotland, and for those in the 30-39 group to figure more prominently, than was the case in E/W(X).

Possessing offensive weapon. In both areas well over half of those facing this charge were under 25 years of age. More in Scotland (20%) than in E/W(X) (11%) however, were aged 25-29.

Vomiting, urinating etc. This was quite a common charge against drunks in Scotland, but was comparatively rarely used in E/W(X). Comparisons

between the two areas of the ages of those charged in this way must be evaluated in the light of this fact. The under-20's contributed less to this charge in Scotland (14%) than in E/W(X) (24%), and those aged 30-39 contributed more (Sc. 22%, E/W(X) 13%).

Other Charges. Half of the unclassified charges in E/W(X), but only 10% of those in Scotland, were attributable to young persons aged under 18. No more detailed analysis was made, but the difference probably indicates that miscellaneous charges in E/W(X) centre to a large extent on drinking under age, while in Scotland they cover a wider range of behaviour. This would be in accordance with the tendency in Scotland to relate charges against drunks more closely to their behaviour than is the case in E/W(X).

In the present writer's opinion, the principal significance of these results is the indication they give that charges of violence against persons or property in Scotland tend to be made against older drunks than do the corresponding charges in E/W(X). While superficially this trend would suggest that violence is more common among the over-25's who are drunk in Scotland than it is in E/W(X), such an interpretation must be evaluated in the light of the different policy pursued in Scotland in formulating charges.

(iii) Sex, age and charge

Table S23 is an analysis by age within sex of the main types of charge in the two areas. The charges are considered in three main groups: simple drunkenness; breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness; and other charges against drunks. See page 209.

The age distributions of those charged with simple drunkenness are similar for each sex in both areas, and the same is true of those charged with breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness. Although there are substantial differences between the age-distribution of the men and of the women charged, these differences were fairly constant between areas.

The main differences occur among those charged with other offences. In Scotland these are far less likely to be persons aged under 25 than they are in E/W(X); and this is true of both sexes. In Scotland 38% of those men facing other charges were aged under 25, compared with 53% in E/W(X). The corresponding figures for women were 24% and 34%.

Among men in Scotland, the 25-44 age-groups jointly account for nearly half of those facing other charges (49%), compared with little over a third (36%) in E/W(X). The contrast is less marked among women, and mainly confined to the single age-group 35-44. 28% of women facing other charges in Scotland, compared with 17% in E/W(X) were aged 35-44.

These results are consistent with other indications that drunks charged with offences other than those of drunkenness or breach of the peace tend to be rather older in Scotland than in E/W(X). The difference is more marked among men than it is among women, but is common to both sexes.

TABLE S23 (E/W32)

Charges analysed by sex and age

AGE GROUP	MEN						WOMEN					
	Simple Drunkennes only		R of P (Sd) Ag. Dr. (E/W)		Other Charges		Simple Drunkennes only		R of P (Sd) Ag. Dr. (E/W)		Other Charges	
	Sc.	E/W	Sc.	E/W	Sc.	E/W	Sc.	E/W	Sc.	E/W	Sc.	E/W
Under 25	19	16	44	45	26	25	10	13	25	28	24	21
25-34	19	18	27	23	29	24	14	11	26	20	28	20
35-44	24	25	16	18	20	12	22	23	26	27	23	25
45-54	20	22	8	11	9	6	26	21	16	16	16	13
55-64	14	13	4	4	3	2	17	15	5	6	3	4
65-74	5	4	1	1	1	1	7	10	1	1	—	1
Over 74	1	1	*	*	*	*	3	5	*	—	—	1
No Information	1	1	*	1	*	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Base	1233	1148	12454	16085	8804	6086	1130	810	704	689	303	2142
					23091	52882						1066

*No information on sex of offender certified from "Totals" (78 00 2% in Sc. and 74 00 2% in E/W)

(iv) Marital Status

Table S24 compares the marital status of those charged in each area, and whose status was recorded. In both areas no information was available in 7% of all cases.

TABLE S24 (E/W33)

Marital status of those from whom this information was obtained

H

Marital status of those for whom information was available	Scotland	E/W(X)
Single	%	%
Married	46	61
Widowed, separated or divorced	48	32
	6	7
Bases (all for whom information on marital status was available)	33426	32183
Proportion of total for whom no information on marital status was available	7%	7%

Nearly half of those charged in Scotland (48%) compared with only about one third (32%) in E/W(X) were married people.

(v) Residential Status

Table S25 compared the residential status of those charged in the two areas.

TABLE S25 (E/W34)

Residential status of persons charged

H

	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
Permanent resident in area of reporting police force	79	60
Temporary resident in area	4	11
Normally resident elsewhere in British Isles	10	15
No fixed abode	5	12
Normally resident outside British Isles	1	1
No information	1	1
Base	36111	34642

Those charged in Scotland were much more likely to be permanent residents in the area of the reporting police force (79%) than were those charged in E/W(X) (60%). This might be partially attributable to the greater geographical areas served by some of the Scottish forces by comparison with their counterparts in E/W(X), but the lower incidence both of persons of no fixed abode and of visitors normally resident elsewhere in the British Isles suggests that there is a real difference—"locals" making up a greater proportion of drunks charged with an offence in Scotland than in E/W(X).

Residential status and charges

Table S26 shows the distribution by residential status of those facing each of the three main type of charges in the two areas. (This Table omits those in either area who were not charged either with an offence of drunkenness or a breach of the peace).

TABLE S26 (E/W35)

Charges by residential status

Charge	Residential status						Bases
	Permanent resident in area of reporting force	Temporary resident in area	Resident outside area	No fixed abode	Resident outside British Isles	No information	
<i>Simple drunkenness</i>							
Scotland %	74	4	13	8	*	1	13969
E/W(X) %	53	13	14	18	1	1	12430
<i>Breach of the peace (Sc:) Ag Dr. (E/W)</i>							
Scotland %	82	4	10	3	1	1	13382
E/W(X) %	63	10	16	9	2	1	16891
<i>Breach of the peace (Sc:) Dr. (E/W) and another reference</i>							
Scotland %	82	6	8	2	1	1	2668
E/W(X) %	66	11	15	7	1	*	4272

*Less than 0.5%.

In both Scotland and in E/W(X) those charged with simple drunkenness were the *least* likely to be permanent residents in the area of the reporting police force, and the most likely to be persons of no fixed abode. In Scotland, though not in E/W(X), simple drunkenness offenders were more likely than others to be visitors to the area.

In both Scotland and E/W(X) the distribution by residential status of those charged with a breach of the peace or aggravated drunkenness did not differ greatly from that of persons charged with multiple offences which included one either of breach of the peace or of aggravated drunkenness. But more than four out of five of those in each of these groups in Scotland, compared with only two-thirds in E/W(X), were permanent residents in the area of the reporting police force.

(vi) Country of Birth

Table S27 compares the two areas in respect of the country of birth of those charged.

TABLE S27 (E/W36)
Country of birth of offender

H

Country of Birth	Scotland	E/W(X)
Scotland	91.6 %	8.1 %
England	1.8	65.4†
Wales	0.1	4.2†
Northern Ireland	1.3	4.4
Eire	2.6	11.7
Poland	0.2	1.2
Lithuania	*	0.3
Other European countries	0.3	1.4
India	0.1	0.5
Pakistan	0.1	0.2
Other Asian countries	*	0.1
West Indies	*	0.4
Rest of American continent	0.2	0.2
Africa	*	0.4
Australia	*	0.1
No information	1.7	1.5
Bases	36111	34642

*Less than 0.5%.

†includes English-born charged in Wales (1.4%).

‡includes Welsh-born charged in Wales (3.0%) and Welsh-born charged in England (1.2%).

More than nine out of ten of the drunks charged in Scotland were born in that country, compared with only a little more than two thirds who were native-born among those charged in E/W(X).

The English-born charged in Scotland made up only 1.8% of those charged in that country, whereas the Scottish-born made up 8.1% of those charged in E/W(X).

Clearly, in Scotland to a much greater extent than in E/W(X) the drunkenness problem centres on the native-born (as well as on local residents).

An analysis, corresponding to that given in Table 37 of the English part of this report, was made of the country of birth of those showing each of the main types of behaviour. This showed that between 90% and 94% of those showing each of ten different sorts of behaviour, and also of those showing no aggravating behaviour, in Scotland were persons born in that country. In view of this result, there seems little purpose in reproducing a detailed comparative Table here.

Table 38 in the English part of the report was an analysis based on those charged either with an offence of simple drunkenness, aggravated drunkenness only, or drunkenness at the same time as another offence, which showed the distribution of persons born in different countries among those charged with each of these three types of offence. It is not possible to make any precise comparison between the two areas in relation to these facts, because of the impossibility of determining which charges in Scotland correspond to those of aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X). However, if we take as our bases drunkenness offenders and those charged with breach of the peace (in both cases either as a single charge or as part of a multiple one), we find that the Irish-born in Scotland tend to be charged with simple drunkenness (57%) substantially more than other groups in that country (39-46%). In E/W(X) there was little difference in the proportions of each group, *other than the native-born*, to be charged

TABLE S2B (E/W39)
Country of birth and degree of incapacity

DEGREE OF INCAPACITY	COUNTRY OF BIRTH															
	Scottish in	English and Welsh in		Scottish in	N. Ireland and Eire		Europe		Rest of world		No information		Total			
		E/(WX)	Sc.		E/(WX)	Sc.	E/(WX)	Sc.	E/(WX)	Sc.	E/(WX)	Sc.	E/(WX)	Sc.		
Total or near-total incapacity	28	30	22	39	34	44	27	44	22	43	44	47	28	36		
Partial incapacity	21	38	20	42	33	41	26	40	26	40	22	40	21	39		
Incoherent only	11	8	10	7	10	6	12	4	10	6	9	5	11	7		
None of these	40	24	48	13	33	9	35	12	42	11	26	8	40	18		
Bases	33084	24100	675	2784	1397	5542	173	989	209	711	534	471	36072	34597		

Note. This Table does not exactly correspond with Table 39 for England and Wales, since some regrouping of country of birth has been done.

with simple drunkenness only. Amongst those charged with an offence of drunkenness in E/W(X) 33% of the native-born were charged with simple drunkenness only, but a substantially higher proportion of both the Scottish-born, the Irish-born, other Europeans and those drunks born outside Europe (40%–49%) were charged only with simple drunkenness.

Table S28 shows the degree of incapacity reported from each area of those born in different countries. See page 213.

The outstanding results shown by this Table may be summarised as follows:

Country of Birth	Percentage of those born in this country who were reported to be totally or nearly totally incapable	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
Native-born [Scots in Scotland, English and Welsh born in E/W(X)]	28%	30%
Other Great Britain [English and Welsh in Scotland; Scottish-born in E/W(X)]	22%	39%
Northern Ireland and Eire	34%	44%
Rest of Europe	27%	44%
Rest of World	22%	43%

In Scotland the Irish-born were the group most often reported as totally incapable or nearly so; in E/W(X) the Irish-born were reported to be in this state with about the same frequency as other Europeans, and people born outside Europe, though rather more frequently than the Scottish-born. In both areas the proportion of native-born offenders who were reported as being totally or nearly totally incapable was approximately the same (28–30%); but in Scotland this proportion was rather greater than that found amongst other groups *excepting the Irish-born*; whereas in E/W(X) it was appreciably less than that found among other groups.

It may be concluded that the rather small proportion of drunks born in Ireland who appear among those charged in Scotland tend towards a higher degree of incapability than other groups, whereas in E/W(X) they share this tendency with all groups other than the native-born. The minority of Irish-born drunks in Scotland probably present a special problem to the police because of their tendency towards "flat-out" drunkenness.

(vii) Employment Status

The employment status of those charged in the two areas is shown in Table S29.

TABLE S29 (E/W40)

Employment Status

H		
Employment status	Scotland	E/W(X)
Manual	57	58
Retired	2	2
Unemployed	21	22
Casual or seasonal workers	3	5
Seamen	3	4
H.M. Forces	2	2
Other employment (including housewives)	5	4
No information	7	3
Bases	36111	34642

TABLE S30 (E/W41)
Charges and Employment Status

Charges	Married	Retired	Unemployed	Casual or seasonal	Scoutmen	H.M. Forces	Other	No infraction	Base
1. Simple drunkenness only S ₁ E/W(X)	52 50	5 4	24 27	3 6	3 4	1 1	6 5	7 3	13569
2. Breach of the peace etc. only S ₂ E/W(X)	60 61	1 1	19 20	3 3	3 3	2 2	4 4	8 3	13382
3. Breach of the peace etc. at same time as another offence S ₃ E/W(X)	51 65	1 1	22 11	3 3	3 3	3 2	5 4	6 2	2668
4. Damage to property S ₄ E/W(X)	56 62	1 1	24 20	4 3	3 4	3 2	4 4	6 2	1094
12. Obstructing the police S ₁₂ E/W(X)	56 69	1 0	21 16	3 4	3 3	2 3	5 4	8 2	906
6. Disorderliness S ₆ E/W(X)	55 65	1 1	22 16	2 6	3 3	2 2	6 5	8 1	368
11. Indecent language S ₁₁ E/W(X)	63 64	* 1	18 18	2 7	4 3	1 2	9 4	3 2	255
4. Assault S ₄ E/W(X)	63 70	1 0	22 14	3 5	2 5	1 2	4 3	4 2	2808
7. Theft S ₇ E/W(X)	51 60	1 1	28 23	3 6	2 2	3 6	6 2	6 1	1036
5. Possessing offensive weapon S ₅ E/W(X)	59 69	1 0	22 17	5 1	1 3	1 3	3 6	8 1	263
9. Unruly, vomiting, etc. S ₉ E/W(X)	70 61	* 2	11 16	2 4	3 4	4 7	5 4	6 4	2045
10, 13, 14. Others S _{10, 13, 14} E/W(X)	47 75	1 +	31 13	4 1	3 1	3 2	6 8	5 1	246
Total	57 58	2 2	21 22	3 5	3 4	2 2	5 4	7 3	36072

*Less than 0.5%.

The distribution of offenders by employment status was very closely similar in each of the two areas.

An analysis of the employment status of those charged with each type of offence, corresponding with Table 41 in the English text, was made. This did show up certain differences between areas, but the results are very difficult to interpret. The Table is reproduced as Table S30, without subsequent comment. See page 215.

(viii) Number of persons involved

Table S31 shows the proportion of persons charged with an offence of drunkenness or of breach of the peace in the two areas who were accompanied, at the time of police intervention, by no one else; by one person only; and by two or more persons. The following groups are separately considered: those charged with simple drunkenness only; with aggravated drunkenness or breach of the peace only; and with either of these offences at the same time as another offence.

TABLE S31 (E/W42)
Number of persons accompanying those charged
The three main charge-groups

H		
Charge and number accompanying person charged	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
<i>Simple Drunkenness</i>		
No one accompanying	96	91
One person accompanying	3	6
Two or more persons accompanying	*	2
No information	1	1
Bases	13977	12430
<i>Breach of the Peace (Sc.)</i>		
<i>Aggravated Drunkenness (E/W)</i>		
No one accompanying	49	56
One person accompanying	26	21
Two or more persons accompanying	23	21
No information	2	2
Bases	13203	16890
<i>Breach of the Peace (Sc.) Drunkenness (E/W)</i> <i>at the same time as another Offence</i>		
No one accompanying	52	46
One person accompanying	22	22
Two or more persons accompanying	24	28
No information	2	4
Bases	2490	4272

*less than 0.5%

In Scotland the simple drunkenness offender was even more frequently on his own (96%) than he was in E/W(X). This is in accordance with the tendency in Scotland for the charge of simple drunkenness to be made even more exclusively than in E/W(X) against persons with no form of aggravating behaviour recorded against them (c.f. Table S11). Those people arrested primarily for their own protection are unlikely to be accompanied—unless by someone equally incapable.

Those charged with breach of the peace only in Scotland were rather more often accompanied (49%) than were those charged with aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X) (42%) but those facing multiple charges were less often accompanied in Scotland (46%) than in E/W(X) (50%).

These differences are minor ones, and do not indicate any consistent differences of note between the two areas.

Behaviour of solitary offenders

Table S32 compares the proportion of those showing each of the main forms of behaviour in the two areas who were unaccompanied.

TABLE S32 (E/W43)
Behaviour of solitary offenders

Behaviour	Proportion of those behaving in this way who were unaccompanied.		Bases	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
13. No aggravating behaviour	96%	91%	13452	11600
1. Physical violence	33%	31%	6673	5634
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	58%	51%	4608	4197
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	47%	53%	1706	8144
4. Insulting language or behaviour	55%	57%	11711	10958
5. Sexual behaviour	70%	49%	392	334
6. Obstructing the police	47%	37%	954	2392
7. Theft	66%	54%	1112	431
8. Damage to property	58%	52%	1468	2322
12. Urinating, vomiting etc.	83%	73%	2496	2470
9, 10, 11. Other	54%	55%	932	846

In Scotland the proportion of those reported to have behaved in each of the following ways who were unaccompanied substantially exceeded those found in E/W(X). Differences of 10% or more between areas are noted:

Sexual behaviour (70% unaccompanied in Scotland; 49% in E/W(X)).

Note: The greater part of the behaviour included under this heading consisted of soliciting, and a person would not usually be considered as "accompanying" the person solicited).

Obstructing the police (47% and 37%)

Theft (66% and 54%)

Urinating, vomiting etc. (83% and 73%)

The implications of these differences are not clear. Aside from urinating and vomiting, they might possibly reflect a greater capacity for considered action by drunks in Scotland, but this is a highly speculative interpretation.

Table S33 compares the distribution of solitary offenders among those showing differing degrees of incapacity in the two areas.

All four of the groups described in this Table were more often reported as unaccompanied at the time of police intervention in Scotland than was the case in E/W(X). In both areas, however, the lesser the gross physical manifestations of drunkenness were, the more likely was the alleged offender to be accompanied by someone at the time of police intervention.

TABLE S33 (E/W44)
Distribution of solitary offenders among those with differing degrees of incapacity

Degree of Incapacity	Proportion who were unaccompanied		Bases	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
Total or near-total incapacity	96 %	91 %	10178	10071
Partial incapacity	76 %	67 %	7671	12553
Incoherent only	64 %	56 %	3907	2934
Neither incapable nor incoherent	52 %	43 %	14276	9007
No information	—	—	40	32

Note: Table S33 is based on the whole sample whereas Table 31 was based on those who were charged with an offence of drunkenness or one of breach of the peace.

Number of persons charged as a result of a single incident

Table S34 shows the proportions of all persons who were charged as a result of incidents in which they were the only person charged; one of two persons charged; and one of three or more persons charged.

TABLE S34 (E/W45)
Persons charged as a result of incidents in which only one; two; and three or more persons were charged

Number of different persons charged as result of incident	Proportion of all persons who were charged as a result of incidents in which this number of different persons were charged	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
One person only charged	78	78
Two persons charged	13	14
Three or more charged	7	8
Bases	36072	34597

The difference between the two areas were negligible, about four out of five persons being charged as a result of incidents in which they were the only one to be charged, 13-14% as a result of incidents in which two were charged; and 7-8% as a result of incidents leading to three or more people being charged.

No Table corresponding with Table 46 in the English text is given here, because of difficulty in comparing aggravated drunkenness charges with those of breach of the peace, but a comparison between areas of those charged with simple drunkenness shows that if a simple drunk was accompanied by anyone, there was about an even chance of his companion being charged, too.

(ix) Physical injury and personal material loss

Table S35 compares the two areas in respect of the proportions of persons showing each of the main types of behaviour who were reported to have inflicted personal injuries or caused any personal loss to a third party.

TABLE S35 (E/W47, expanded)
Charge in relation to persons suffering physical injury or personal loss

CHARGE	Persons suffering physical injury or personal loss							
	Naions	Offender and/or associates only	Spouse or relative	Strangers to offender (members of the public)	Personal enemies of offender	Police Officers	Officials etc. other than police	BASES
1. Simple Drunkenness only % E/W(X) Sc	97 95	3 4	0 *	0 *	0 *	0 *	0	1789
2. Breach of the peace only % E/W(X) Sc	90 92	7 5	1 1	1 1	*	1 1	*	1332
3. Drunkenness with aggression % Sc	47	8	14	17	3	11	5	2668
3. Breach of the peace Drunkenness at the same time as another offence % E/W(X)	62	11	1	9	*	18	2	4272
7. Damage to property % E/W(X) Sc	61 61	11 13	8 1	15 13	3 1	4 10	2 2	1096
12. Obstructing the police % E/W(X) Sc	48 36	9 13	6 1	6 5	1 *	41 25	1 2	906
6. Disorderliness % E/W(X) Sc	90 78	4 12	1 *	2 3	0 *	3 7	2 2	1360
11. Indecent language % E/W(X) Sc	95 82	2 4	1 *	*	*	0 9	*	1195
4. Assault % E/W(X) Sc	17 10	6 15	44 9	25 50	5 6	2 15	7 10	255
8. Theft % E/W(X) Sc	71 69	4 6	1 0	22 16	*	1 7	2 4	2688
5. Possessing offensive weapons % E/W(X) Sc	73 71	10 11	2 1	10 11	1 1	6 7	1 2	1035
9. Unlawful, wounding etc. % E/W(X) Sc	99 98	*	0 1	0 0	0 0	1 1	*	263
10, 13, 14. Other charges % E/W(X) Sc	87 80	4 6	0 *	8 5	1 0	2 4	1 3	2045
TOTAL	86 83	5 4	4 *	5 2	1 *	1 3	1 *	346
								34972

Note: In view of the larger number of charges other than those of drunkenness or breach of the peace which were reported from Scotland, this Table expands considerably on the corresponding one (Table 47) for England and Wales.

In total, any type of injury or personal loss was reported in 14% of all cases in Scotland, and in 11% in E/W(X).

Little difference between areas was apparent in relation to those charged with simple drunkenness, or with aggravated drunkenness or breach of the peace only (charges 1 and 2 in Table).

However, those facing multiple charges which included a charge of drunkenness or one of breach of the peace (charge 3 in Table) included many more people who had inflicted personal injury or loss in Scotland (53%) than was the case in E/W(X) (38%). Detailed inspection shows that this difference is attributable, firstly, to the much greater proportion of these cases in Scotland than in E/W(X) in which injuries (or loss) were inflicted on a spouse or relative (14% Sc. 1% E/W(X)); and, secondly, to the greater proportion of cases in which a drunk inflicted injury or loss on a member of the public who was a stranger to him (17% Sc. and 9% E/W(X)). (In Scotland multiple charges which included a charge of breach of the peace less often referred to people who had inflicted injury or loss on members of their own group, or on police officers, than did those multiple charges which included one of drunkenness in E/W(X)).

Considering all multiple charges in association with each of the individual charges, it is clear that:

- i the involvement of a *spouse or relative* on whom injury (or personal loss) was inflicted was much more common in Scotland than it was in E/W(X) (14% and 1% of all multiple charges in the two areas, respectively).

This is particularly evident in the case of assault charges, 44% of which in Scotland, but only 9% in E/W(X), were associated with offenders' behaviour towards a spouse or relative. It is also true of charges of damage to property, obstructing the police, and to a lesser degree of other charges as well.

These major differences between the cases reported from the two areas are largely attributable to the slightly different criteria used by the police in Scotland in deciding which cases of drunken behaviour to report. Because the charge of aggravated drunkenness is little used in Scotland a behavioural criterion was applied, which enabled offences in private places to be reported. Charges of drunkenness, or the direct alternatives or substitutes for such charges, to which the reports from E/W(X) were confined, apply almost exclusively to offences which occur in public places.

- ii personal injury or loss to *members of the public* unknown to the offender, to *personal enemies*, and to *officials* other than the police, were all more commonly associated with multiple charges in Scotland than they were in E/W(X) (17% and 9%; 3% and under 0.5%; 5% and 2%, in the two areas respectively). The difference is not markedly associated with any one type of charge, and charges of assault much less frequently involved strangers in Scotland (25%) than was the case in E/W(X) (50%).
- iii personal injury (or loss) to *police officers* was less often associated with multiple charges in Scotland (11%) than in E/W(X) (18%). The difference between the areas is apparent in relation to each type of charge listed in the Table. In particular, assault charges, charges of indecent language and charges of theft or fraud were less often associated with injury (or loss) to police officers in Scotland than they were in E/W(X). And, although in Scotland as in E/W(X) charges of obstructing the police were very often

associated with actual injury or loss to a police officer, this was less frequently the case in Scotland (41 %) than it was in E/W(X) (55%).

In evaluating these results, a number of important points must be borne in mind. First, despite the fact that acts of violence by drunks which took place in their homes might be reported from Scotland but not from E/W(X), the overall proportion of drunks in Scotland who were reported to have displayed physical violence in their *behaviour* was only slightly greater in Scotland than in E/W(X)—c.f. Tables S6 and S10. Secondly, the sorts of violence which could qualify for inclusion in Scotland were likely to encompass a wider range than was the case in E/W(X). Thirdly, the tendency in Scotland to relate the charge to the drunks actions rather than to the state of drunkenness which provoked them was likely to lead to a wider variety of charges against drunks in Scotland than in E/W(X).

Bearing these facts in mind, it would, in the present writer's opinion, be tendentious to interpret these results firmly in terms of real differences between the two areas. There are, however, indications that violence among drunks in Scotland is more likely than in E/W(X) to be directed against persons outside the offender's own group. This suggests that violence among drunks in Scotland, though little more common, is likely to present a greater social problem than it does in E/W(X). The comparative infrequency with which violence by drunks involves the police in Scotland might indicate a greater deference to the police; but, equally, it might indicate no more than a greater certainty in the police officer's mind as to whether an arrest was indicated or not. Such greater certainty might arise from considering primarily the drunks behaviour, irrespective of his drunkenness, rather than giving prior consideration to his drunkenness, with consequent attempts to mitigate the behaviour before deciding to arrest. Either of the above explanations is, of course, highly speculative.

We have already shown (Table S5) that the incidence of every type of behaviour which *could* lead to a chargeable offence against the police is less in Scotland than in E/W(X). This applies to resisting attempts at arrest; trying to rescue others from arrest; other attacks on the police; and to obscene or offensive language directed at the police. It is clear that, quite apart from the more violent manifestations of behaviour discussed above, the police in Scotland are less subject to personal harassment when arresting a drunk than are their counterparts in E/W(X).

(x) Carrying and using weapons

Table S36 shows the proportions in the two areas who carried, and who used, an offensive weapon.

TABLE S36 (E/W49)
Carrying and use of offensive weapons

Did offender use or have in his possession an offensive weapon	Scotland	E/W(X)
Carried weapon, did not use	1.20 %	0.89 %
Used weapon	0.99 %	0.43 %
Had no weapon	95.09 %	95.48 %
No information recorded	2.72 %	3.18 %
Base (all persons charged)	36111	34642

In Scotland about one in every forty-five drunks carried a weapon. This compares with about one in seventy-five in E/W(X). A weapon was used by more than twice as many drunks in Scotland as in E/W(X)—nearly one in a hundred, compared with about one in 250. The difference is consistent with the fact that violence by drunks in Scotland, when it occurs at all, is more likely than it is in E/W(X) to be directed against persons other than the offenders drinking companions.

(xi) Previous Convictions known to the Police

Table S37 compares for the two areas the proportions of current offenders who were known to the local police to have had previous convictions, and whether these convictions were for drunkenness only, for other offence(s), or for both drunkenness and other offences. While an attempt was made to distinguish between convictions for breach of the peace committed while drunk and those committed while sober (and to include the former among drunkenness offences) it is likely that this distinction might, in many cases, be difficult to make in retrospect. Limited reliance must, therefore, be placed on the differences between areas in the proportions reported to have been convicted of offences other than drunkenness only, and those convicted of breach of the peace while drunk or of drunkenness only.

TABLE S37 (E/W50)

Persons charged who were known to the local police to have a previous record of convictions

Previous convictions known to the local police	Scotland	E/W(X)
None	48.1	50.9
For offences other than drunkenness (or breach of the peace while drunk) offences only	26.4	13.6
For Breach of the peace, (while drunk) (Sc) Drunkenness (E/W) only	7.5	12.6
For Breach of the peace (Sc) Drunkenness (E/W) and other offences	18.0	22.9
Bases	36072	34597

A very slightly greater proportion of drunks (52%) were known to the local police in Scotland to have had previous convictions than was the case in E/W(X) (49%). It appears that drunks in Scotland were more frequently than in E/W(X) persons who had previously been convicted of offences other than those of drunkenness or breach of the peace while drunk, but this result must be considered as of dubious validity, in view of the probable difficulty experienced by the local police in Scotland in determining which of a person's previous offences of breach of the peace were committed while drunk, and which were not. The results do, however, give some reason for speculation about differences in the way a man's previous convictions may be presented in court in the two areas. In Scotland a record of non-drunkenness offences appears more likely to be presented than it would be in E/W(X), in a similar case, because of the difference between areas in the way charges against drunks are formulated.

In Scotland rather fewer drunks (18%) were known to have had previous convictions both for breach of the peace and other offences, than were known to have had both drunkenness and other convictions in E/W(X) (23%).

As we pointed out in Part I of this report, it was not practicable for the police to check central records for each drunk's previous record, and these results refer to local police knowledge only. They are consequently almost certainly incomplete, but give some indication of the local nuisance-value or notoriety amongst the police of the offenders. In both areas roughly half of those charged were people known to the local police for their previous record.

* * * * *

The overall proportion of current offenders who were reported to have previous convictions only for drunkenness or breach of the peace while drunk in Scotland (7.5%) was less than that reported to have previous convictions for drunkenness only in E/W(X) (12.6%). But a comparison of these two groups in respect of their *previous* drunkenness (or breach of the peace while drunk) convictions shows extreme uniformity between the two areas. The facts as known to the local police are summarised in Table S38.

TABLE S38 (E/W51)

Number of previous convictions for offences of drunkenness (Sc. drunkenness and/or breach of the peace while drunk) of those known to the local police to have any such convictions

Number of previous convictions for drunkenness and/or breach of the peace while drunk	Scotland	E/W(X)
1	25%	27%
2	16	15
3-5	24	21
6-10	14	13
11-25	11	12
26-50	5	7
Over 50	3	4
Previously convicted but number of times not known	2	1
Bases (those known to have previous convictions for drunkenness)	9193	12276

In both areas those known to have had previous convictions for drunkenness and/or breach of the peace while drunk were made up of about one quarter who were known only to have had one such previous conviction; about two-fifths with between two and five such convictions; and about one-third with six or more. In each area those known to the local police for previous drunkenness convictions or their equivalent included between 8% and 11% with more than 25 known previous convictions for similar offences.

* * * * *

Table S39 compares for the two areas the number of previous drunkenness convictions known to the police for current offenders, with the existence of known convictions for offences other than drunkenness. In the following commentary the phrase "drunkenness conviction" is used to include convictions for breach of the peace while drunk in Scotland, as well as any explicit conviction for an offence of drunkenness.

TABLE S39 (E/W52)

Number of previous convictions for drunkenness (Sc. Drunkenness and/or breach of the peace while drunk) known to local police by whether any previous convictions known for other offences

Number of known previous convictions for drunkenness and/or breach of the peace while drunk		No non-drunkenness conviction known*		Non-drunkenness conviction(s) known†		Bases	
		Sc.	E/W(X)	Sc.	E/W(X)		
None known	%	65	79	35	21	26883	22321
1	%	44	51	55	49	2261	3302
2	%	38	43	62	57	1502	1817
3-5	%	30	34	70	66	2218	2572
6-10	%	16	27	84	73	1296	1566
11-25	%	14	19	86	81	1012	1466
26 or more	%	10	25	90	75	708	1384
Previous convictions but number not known	%	40	38	60	62	159	169
Total	%	56	63	44	37	36039	34597

*including, in Scotland, no previous convictions known either for drunkenness or breach of the peace while drunk.

†in Scotland, including all cases where a conviction for breach of the peace was known, but no such conviction was known to refer to an occasion when the offender was drunk.

The general pattern in the two areas is similar. Those not known to have had previous convictions for drunkenness are less likely than others to have known convictions for other offences. But rather over a third in Scotland, and rather over a fifth in E/W(X) of those current offenders who were not known to have had any previous drunkenness convictions were known to have had other sorts of previous convictions.

Among those known to have had previous drunkenness convictions, the proportion known to have had other previous convictions as well ranged upwards progressively from 55% of those with only one known previous conviction for drunkenness, to 90% of those with more than 25 such convictions. A similar progression was found in E/W(X), with 49% of those with only one previous drunkenness conviction, upwards to 81% of those with between eleven and twenty-five such convictions having known convictions for other offences as well. In E/W(X), but not in Scotland, those with a very large number of previous drunkenness convictions (over 25) were rather less likely than those with a slightly lower record (11-25) to be known to the police for offences other than those of drunkenness.

In all cases, irrespective of the number of known previous convictions for drunkenness, the proportions reported to have had previous convictions for other offences were greater in Scotland than they were in E/W(X). The reported differences may be largely attributable to difficulties experienced by the police in

Scotland in distinguishing retrospectively between breaches of the peace committed while drunk and those committed while sober. These differences are, even though they may not be an objective index of differences in behaviour between the two areas, likely to have a bearing on the way an offender's previous record is presented in court.

The main fact demonstrated by these results is that in both areas a person known to have had previous convictions relating to his state of drunkenness is also very likely to have had previous convictions for other offences as well. This likelihood increases with the number of his known previous convictions for drunkenness. The tendency is more evident in Scotland than in E/W(X), though the difference may relate to differences in the policy of formulating charges in the two areas rather than to true differences in behaviour.

(xii) Celebrations

Table S40 compares for the two areas the proportions of offenders who stated to the police that they were celebrating some particular occasion.

TABLE S40 (E/W53)
Celebration of special occasions and events
(other than parties etc. not held on account of any particular occasion or event)

Occasion or event	Scotland	E/W(X)
	%	%
1. None, or none divulged	93.0	90.2
2. Sporting event	1.6	0.8
3. Wedding, birthday, funeral or similar domestic event	1.5	2.9
4. Christmas, New Year or other national festivity	2.7	4.6
6. Release from prison	0.1	0.2
7. Reunions/farewells	0.2	0.4
9. Works/office parties etc.	0.4	0.3
8. Dances	0.1	0.1
5. Other event	0.3	0.4
No information entered by police	*	0.1
Bases (number of persons)	36111	34642

Differences between area were slight, and in both areas it was found that only very few (7% in Scotland; 10% in E/W(X)) said that they were celebrating any particular occasion. Offenders in Scotland were, in fact, twice as likely as those in E/W(X) to say they had been celebrating a sporting event, but both proportions were very small (1.6% and 0.8%). In Scotland offenders were less likely than in E/W(X) to say they were celebrating domestic events or national festivities. The smallness of the proportions in either area who said they were celebrating anything in particular may perhaps indicate a tendency to leniency towards drunks by the police on occasions for celebration.

(xiii) Type of Drink Consumed

The police in both areas appear, not surprisingly, to have had some difficulty in ascertaining the type(s) of drink consumed by the persons charged. In between 15% and 20% of cases for each sex in each area this information was not

recorded. Since lack of information may not be unrelated to type or mixture of drink, those for whom this information was missing are included in the following Table (S41), and the proportions quoted in the commentary on it as consuming any given type of beverages are consequently minimal.

TABLE S41 (E/W54)
Sex, by type of drink consumed

Type of drink	MALES		FEMALES	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
Beer only	11	63	3	37
Wine (incl. "wine" ciders & perries)	14	4	35	17
Cider only	*	1	*	1
Spirits only	8	4	18	12
Mixts. only	*	1	*	1
Beer with spirits	33	8	12	5
Other mixtures	17	4	16	7
No information on type of drink	17	15	16	20
Bases	33850	32882	2145	1686

Of the *male drunks* charged in Scotland at least half had mixed their drinks—most frequently beer with spirits (33%), but quite often other mixtures (17%). Relatively few had drunk spirits only (8%), wine (14%) being a more common single drink. Only 14% were known to have drunk beer alone.

This is almost the reverse of the pattern found in E/W(X), where nearly two-thirds of the men had drunk beer alone, and only 12% had mixed their drinks. In E/W(X) it was rare for male offenders to have drunk wine alone (4%), and only about half as many as in Scotland (4% compared with 8%) had drunk spirits only.

It is noteworthy that in neither area had more than a small proportion of the male drunks charged consumed spirits only.

Of the *female drunks* charged in Scotland over half had consumed either wine alone (35%) or spirits alone (18%). Wine was twice as often the sole drink of the female offenders in Scotland (35%) as it was in England (17%). In both areas spirits-only drinkers were more commonly found among female than among male offenders.

Women drunks had mixed their drinks more than twice as frequently in Scotland (28%) than in E/W(X) (12%) but the beer and spirits mixture, so commonly reported of the male offenders in Scotland, was comparatively rare among the women (5%).

Only 3% of the women drunks in Scotland consumed beer alone, compared with 37% in E/W(X).

Age and type of drink

We have shown (Table S19) that there was little difference between the two areas in the age-distribution of offenders. In view of the very different drinking habits discussed above, it is of interest to see whether or not offenders who had consumed the same drink in each area were similarly constituted by age. The facts are shown in Table S42.

TABLE S42 (E/W56)
Age analysed by type of drink

Age Groups	Beer		Wine		Cider		Spirits		Misch.		Other single drinks		Beer/Spirits		Other mixed drinks		No information		Total	
	% Sc	% E/W	% Sc	% E/W	% Sc	% E/W	% Sc	% E/W	% Sc	% E/W	% (1)	% (2)	% (1)	% (2)	% (1)	% (2)	% (1)	% (2)	% (1)	% (2)
17-17	51	41	47	48	102	59	34	48	—	—	—	—	15	38	52	42	43	41	53	42
18-19	117	135	60	50	119	59	92	65	—	0.3	—	—	82	111	89	71	102	106	95	117
20-24	22.4	20.0	11.6	8.2	13.5	7.7	18.6	14.9	0.9	1.3	—	—	18.8	21.0	16.6	11.9	19.0	18.1	17.6	18.3
25-29	13.5	13.5	10.8	8.4	5.1	8.5	12.6	9.1	—	1.3	—	—	15.3	13.8	13.2	7.5	13.2	12.3	12.5	11.9
30-39	14.7	18.4	19.4	18.5	18.6	17.6	21.2	20.8	14.4	15.1	(1)	(1)	22.5	19.5	23.6	20.3	19.9	18.9	20.8	18.7
40-49	11.9	17.0	20.8	25.7	13.5	23.3	16.7	21.0	27.0	31.2	(4)	—	17.5	17.4	18.1	24.4	16.2	17.7	17.2	18.4
50-59	6.2	9.3	16.3	18.1	11.9	21.8	11.2	13.2	31.5	29.3	(6)	—	10.6	9.3	10.3	16.2	10.4	11.1	11.1	10.7
60-69	2.6	3.5	8.0	7.2	11.9	8.8	5.0	4.7	13.3	15.4	(1)	(1)	4.1	2.6	4.7	6.8	4.4	4.0	4.8	4.1
70 and over	0.7	1.0	1.8	2.6	1.7	1.1	1.2	1.8	8.1	4.4	(1)	(1)	0.9	0.5	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
No inf. on age	0.2	0.7	0.6	1.3	1.7	0.5	0.6	1.1	2.7	1.3	—	—	0.2	0.9	0.3	0.2	1.4	2.0	0.5	0.9
Totals	3717	21377	5456	1785	59	376	2932	1656	111	317	(13)	(5)	11563	2632	6093	1404	6126	5093	36072	34597

Beer, spirits, and mixed drinks

Comparing the two areas in respect of those offenders who had drunk beer only, spirits only, mixed beer and spirits, and other mixed drinks, we find:

- i *Beer only.* The minority of offenders in Scotland who had consumed beer only tended to be concentrated in the three youngest age groups. 50% of them were aged under 25. In E/W(X), where beer alone was the most common drink among all offenders, only 38% of beer drinkers were aged under 25.
 - ii *Spirits only.* Drinkers of spirits only, a fairly small minority in both areas, were distributed by age in Scotland in a very similar way to the sample as a whole. In E/W(X) each of the three age-groups between 18-19 and 25-29 were under-represented by comparison with the sample of offenders as a whole, and each older group somewhat over-represented. 40% of the drinkers of spirits only in Scotland, but only 30.5% in E/W(X) were aged between 18 and 29.
 - iii *Mixed spirits and beer.* A mixture of spirits and beer was by far the most commonly reported drink of offenders in Scotland, but was comparatively rarely found among offenders in E/W(X). The age distribution of drinkers of this mixture was, however, fairly closely similar in each area. The very young (aged under 20) were under-represented in Scotland, and marginally so in E/W(X). But the differences were slight—10% of beer and spirit mixers were aged under 20 in Scotland, 15% in E/W(X).
- In both areas those in each of the three age-groups from 20-24 and 30-39 were over-represented among beer and spirit mixers. But again the aggregate differences were not great. 57% of beer and spirit mixers in Scotland and 54% in E/W(X) were aged between 20 and 39. This compares with 52% and 49% of the whole samples in the two areas, respectively.
- iv *Other mixed drinks.* In E/W(X) offenders aged 18-29 (in each of the three age-groups concerned) were under-represented among those who had consumed mixed drinks other than beer and spirits. 26.5% fell between these ages, compared with 42% of the sample as a whole.

While differences lying in the same direction were found in Scotland, they were of a negligible size. 39% of those who had consumed other mixed drinks were aged 18-29; 40% of the whole sample.

In both areas those aged 30-49 were over-represented, by comparison with the whole sample, among drinkers of other mixed drinks. But again the differences were not very marked, and were somewhat greater in E/W(X) than in Scotland. In Scotland and in E/W(X) respectively, 42% and 44.5% of those who had drunk other mixed drinks were aged between 30 and 49. This compares with 38% and 37% of the whole samples.

In E/W(X), but not in Scotland, offenders aged 60-69 were also over-represented among those who had drunk other mixed drinks.

Other Drinks

The only other drinks consumed fairly frequently by offenders in both areas were wines, amongst which we have included so-called wine ciders and perries. Comments on cider and methylated spirit drinkers must be confined to broad generalisations, because of the small numbers of these drinkers found.

v *Wines*. There was a slight tendency in both areas for under-age offenders (aged under 18) to be over-represented among wine drinkers. This might possibly arise from the consumption of "light" drinks, such as champagne ciders, which have a high alcoholic content, by young people unaccustomed to drinking.

Each of the three subsequent age-groups, covering the age-range 18-29, were quite heavily under-represented among wine-drinkers. 28% in Scotland, and 22% in E/W(X) fell within this range, by comparison with 41-42% of the whole sample in each area. Those aged 50 and over—in each of the three age-bands comprising this group—tended to be over-represented in both areas among wine drinkers, and to much the same extent. 26% of wine drinkers in Scotland and 28% in E/W(X) were aged 50 and over, compared with 17% and 16% of the whole samples in these areas.

vi *Cider*. The number of cider drinkers found among offenders in Scotland was too small (59 cases) for useful comparisons to be made between areas. As with wine, there appears to be some tendency in both areas for under-age drinkers to be over-represented, most markedly in Scotland. In both areas those in each age-band between 20-24 and 30-39 are under-represented.

vii *Methylated spirits*. In both areas offenders who had drunk methylated spirits were very rarely under 30 (1% Sc; 3% E/W(X)). Between 14% and 15% were 30-39, compared with 21% and 19% of the whole samples. Subsequent age-groups were all heavily over-represented. About half (55% in Scotland and 49% in E/W(X)) of those offenders who had drunk methylated spirits were aged 50 and over, compared with 17% and 16% of all offenders.

We have commented on these results in some detail in order, principally, to stress the similarities between the two areas in the age-distribution of those who consume the same drinks, which exists despite the major disparities between the areas in offenders' drinking habits. The main exceptions were the tendency in Scotland for drinkers of beer only to be concentrated in the younger age-groups, and the under-representation of these groups among drinkers of beer and spirits mixed. This suggests no more than a probable tendency in Scotland for young drinkers to start on beer alone, but quite soon to pass on to beer and spirits mixed. Drinking of spirits alone among offenders in Scotland showed little or no sign of being concentrated in any particular age-group, though in E/W(X) the young were under-represented among spirits-only drinkers. This suggests that spirits in Scotland are acceptable drinks among persons of all ages, whereas in E/W(X) they tend to be more acceptable among rather older people.

The youngest and the eldest

In Table S43 persons at the two extremes of the age-scale—offenders aged under 25 and those aged 50 and over, are considered in relation to the contribution they made to the total of offenders who had drunk each type of drink in the two areas.

The young offenders contributed most to *beer-only* drinking in both areas, though their contribution was much greater in Scotland (50%) than it was in E/W(X) (38%).

Their contribution to *cider*-drinking was low in E/W(X). In Scotland the number of cider drinkers was too small for much reliance to be placed on the results.

TABLE S43 (E/W57)

Contribution of those age under 25, and of those aged 50 and over, to all offenders stated to have consumed each type of drink

Drink	THE YOUNG		THE MIDDLE-AGED AND OLD		Drink
	Proportion of all offenders known to have drunk this drink who were under 25		Proportions of all offenders known to have drunk this drink who were aged 50 and over		
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)	
1 Beer only	50%	38%	55%	49%	Meths.
2 Cider only	(36%)	20	26	28	Wine only
3 Spirits only	31	26	(25)	32	Cider only
4 Beer and spirits	29	36	17	19	Spirits only
5 Mixed drinks other than beer/spirits	29	23	16	12	Beer and spirits
6 Wine only	22	18	16	24	Mixed drinks other than beer/spirits
7 Meths.	1	2	10	14	Beer only
Proportion of all offenders who fell into this age-group	31	34	17	16	

Note: Bracketted percentages are based on 59 cider drinkers only in Scotland.

In Scotland the young contributed as much to the drinking of *spirits only* as they did to drinking by offenders in general; in E/W(X) they contributed substantially less.

The contribution of the young to the drinking of *mixed beer and spirits* was slightly less in Scotland, and slightly more in E/W(X) than was their contribution to all drinking. In Scotland they contributed as much to the drinking of *other mixed drinks* as they did to drinking beer and spirits mixed. In E/W(X) they contributed much less, and there their contribution fell much below that which they made to drinking by offenders in general.

In both areas the contribution of the young to *wine-drinking* fell well below their total contribution to all drinks by offenders, and very few indeed of those drinking methylated spirits were young.

The old constituted $52 \pm 3\%$ of methylated spirit drinkers in both areas, and contributed much more to *wine* and *cider* drinking than they did to drinking in general. Their contribution to *spirit-only* drinking was much the same as was their contribution to all drinking, in both areas. The same was true of their contribution to the drinking of *mixed beer and spirits* in Scotland, and of *other mixed drinks*. In E/W(X) they contributed less to *beer-with-spirits* drinking, and more to the drinking of *other mixed drinks*, than they did to drinking in general.

In both areas the old contributed less to the drinking of *beer only* than they did to drinking in general, the contrast being fairly marked in Scotland, but slight in E/W(X).

These results do not add greatly to those we have already discussed. They illustrate again the greater concentration of beer-only drinkers among the young in Scotland by comparison with E/W(X), and the lesser contribution of beer and spirit mixers. They show drinking of spirits-only not to be especially concentrated among either the young or the old in Scotland, but to be less prevalent

than all drinking amongst young offenders in E/W(X). In both areas the greatest concentration of old people was found among drinkers of methylated spirits, wine and cider—particularly among methylated spirit drinkers, and with little difference between area in respect of wine and cider.

Persons taken into custody for their own protection, in relation to the beverages they had drunk

It is not, of course, possible to isolate those drunks who were taken into custody purely for their own protection from those who, although their sole offence might lie in their drunken state, might not ostensibly be endangering themselves. Drunks who were asleep or wholly immobilised could be considered as falling into the latter group, at least in those instances in which they were not close to traffic or any other physical hazard which might later threaten them. Clearly drunks cannot be "left lying about" in public places, and it is doubtless a matter of opinion in many instances whether a given drunk is taken into custody primarily for his own protection, or primarily to clear him from the street.

However, drunks reported to have shown no aggravating behaviour at all may, in one sense, be considered as a rather different type of offender from the rest. They are doing nothing positive to annoy, threaten or endanger others when arrested, and may indeed have "passed out" without having previously done anything of this sort.

Earlier in this part of the report, we laid some stress on the apparently greater tolerance in Scotland for merely irritating behaviour by drunks, as evidenced by the much lesser incidence in that country than E/W(X) of reported behaviour classified as "public nuisance" behaviour,—i.e. mainly mere rowdiness confined to the drunks own group. We expressed the opinion that the true incidence of such behaviour was unlikely to be so very much less in Scotland than it was in England and Wales, and suggested that the fact that it was so much less frequently *reported* of the offenders in Scotland probably indicated tolerance of it in that country.

It is important to indicate here that there is no evidence of this greater tolerance extending to those who *may*, simply because of their incapacity, be a danger to themselves. This is already suggested by the fact that the proportions of all drunks who were charged only with an offence of simple drunkenness were similar in both areas. In Table S44 we compare, for the two areas, the proportions among those who had drunk each type of drink who were reported as showing no aggravating behaviour at all.

The considerable majority of those charged in either area who had drunk methylated spirits were reported as showing no aggravating behaviour at all. Well over two-fifths of those who had drunk either cider or wine showed no aggravating behaviour, and about two-fifths of those who had consumed mixed drinks other than beer and spirits. Rather less than two-fifths of those who had mixed beer and spirits were reported to have shown no aggravating behaviour. In all these cases, the proportions showing no aggravating behaviour were a little greater—though usually only marginally so—in Scotland than they were in E/W(X). These results give no indication that the "flat-out" drunk may be tolerated more in Scotland than in E/W(X)—though, of course, they offer no positive proof either way. (It is possible, though it appears rather improbable, that whichever of the drinks described above he consumes, a drunk in Scotland is more liable to become incapacitated than his counterpart in E/W(X)).

TABLE S44 (E/W59(i))

Drunks apprehended who showed no aggravating behaviour, and were assumedly taken in custody for their own protection

Analysed in relation to the drink(s) they had consumed

Drink(s) consumed	Percentages showing no aggravating behaviour among those who had consumed the drink(s) specified		Bases	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
Methylated spirits	64%	58%	111	317
Cider only	46	45	59	376
Wine only	45	43	5456	1705
Mixed drinks other than beer and spirits	38	39	6108	1409
Beer and spirits	38	36	11563	2632
Spirits only	37	51	2932	1676
Beer only	21	30	3717	21377

(i) Note: A full comparative Table corresponding to Table 58 in Part I of this report has been prepared. The behavioural differences by area which it shows tend to be related to differences in the ratios between those showing no aggravating behaviour, and some such behaviour. For comparative purposes, it was thought more profitable to consider only those showing some aggravating behaviour, and this is done in the next Table (S45).

Those offenders who drank spirits only were much more often reported as showing no aggravating behaviour in E/W(X) (51%) than were their counterparts in Scotland (37%). This could well be attributable to the tendency for spirit-only drinkers to be older in E/W(X) than those in Scotland. We have shown (Table S21) that the older an offender is, the more likely he is to be totally or nearly totally incapable.

Those offenders in Scotland who drank beer only were considerably less likely (21%) than their counterparts in E/W(X) (30%) to have no aggravating behaviour reported against them. This again may well be attributable to the much heavier representation of younger people among the minority who had drunk beer-only in Scotland, by comparison with their representation among the majority of drunks who were beer-only drinkers in E/W(X).

We may conclude that, having looked for any evidence that the incapable drunk is differently treated in the two areas, we have found none. This is not, of course, positive proof that no such difference exists; such proof could be derived only from a study of all drunks, rather than just those charged with an offence. But, in view of the higher threshold of tolerance indicated in Scotland by the much lower incidence of reported "public nuisance" behaviour, the similarity between the results reported above for the two areas may be taken as strong circumstantial evidence that tolerance in Scotland does not extend to the "flat out" drunk.

Type of drink and behaviour

The figures given in Table S45 are based on those showing any aggravating behaviour among drinkers of each type of drink. The Table shows, for each drink in each area, the distribution of the main types of behaviour among those who had consumed it.

TABLE S45 (E/W/60)

Aggravating behaviour in relation to type of drink consumed
(Those showing aggravating behaviour only)

N.B. Where the base is less than 50, all figures are bracketed, and numbers not percentages, are given.

Behaviour	DRINK(S) CONSUMED										Total
	Beer	Wines	Cider	Spirits	Methylated spirits	Beer and spirits	Other mixed drinks	No information			
1. Physical violence	% 52	% 24	% (5)	% 24	% (2)	% 23	% 22	% 28	% 24	% 24	
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour	17	21	(4)	21	(14)	23	20	15	20	18	
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	9	9	(3)	6	(3)	6	8	8	8	35	
4. Insulting language or behaviour	45	58	(25)	48	(19)	52	57	49	52	48	
5. Sexual behaviour	1	2	(1)	3	(0)	1	1	2	2	2	
6. Obstructing the police	3	4	(3)	4	(0)	4	4	5	4	10	
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	5	4	(3)	6	(3)	5	4	4	5	2	
8. Damage to property	8	6	(3)	6	(3)	7	6	6	6	10	
12. Urinating, vomiting etc	13	8	(3)	10	(3)	12	10	11	11	11	
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	5	5	(2)	3	(3)	4	4	4	4	4	
Base (persons with aggravating behaviour)	2820	3400	(32)	1837	(46)	7216	3552	3974	3340	23620	
Scotland E/W (X)	1468	969	306	121	133	594	852	3340	3340	22897	

This Table* shows no outstanding differences of behaviour in relation to drinks most commonly consumed, and, where such differences were found and the behaviour was sufficiently common to show up important differences between area, there is no indication of major area differences in the *relative* frequency with which different drinks were associated with a given form of behaviour.

For example, although the overall incidence of *physical violence* was rather greater in Scotland than in E/W(X), in both areas it was rather more commonly reported of beer drinkers and beer and spirits mixers than of other drinkers. *Threatening or aggressive* behaviour was rather more commonly reported of those who had mixed their drinks or had drunk spirits only than it was of others—again in both areas.

But differences were small, and gave no indication that having drunk any given type of drink was at all closely associated with any given type of behaviour. Such minor associations as were found are as likely to be associated with characteristics of the type of person who tends to consume the drink in question (e.g. their age) as with the nature of the drink itself. The results, in general, reinforce the conclusion already drawn in relation to those from England and Wales—namely, that it is the amount people drink rather than the type of drink they consume which is likely to influence their behaviour.

The very different distribution of the different beverages between offenders in the two areas does not, in itself, appear to have any marked effect on the distribution of behaviour. It was not within the scope of this inquiry to compare the *amounts* consumed in the two areas.

Type of drink in relation to employment status

Table S46 shows the employment status of those who had consumed each type of drink in the two areas.

Again there are some striking similarities between the two areas. Drinkers of *beer only*, though they made up the majority in E/W(X) and only a fairly small minority in Scotland, were distributed almost identically by employment status in each area, about two-thirds being employed manual workers and about one-fifth being unemployed at the time of the incident which led to their being charged.

At the other extreme were drinkers of *methylated spirits*, who were rarely in full-time employment and three-quarters of whom were unemployed in both areas; and wine-drinkers about a third of whom were in manual employment, and over two fifths unemployed in both areas. Comparison between areas of *cider drinkers* is unreliable because of the small numbers found in Scotland, and the absence of information on the employment status of an unusually high proportion of them, but the results for E/W(X) show that well over half were either unemployed or were casual or seasonal workers.

The principal differences between the two areas occur in relation to drinkers of *spirits only*, of *mixed drinks* other than beer with spirits, and to a lesser extent among drinkers of *beer and spirits mixed*. In all cases these differences run in the same direction. Considerably more of the drinkers in Scotland than in E/W(X)

*It should be born in mind that this Table is based only on those offenders who showed aggravating behaviour. A quite different picture emerges, of course, if those showing no aggravating behaviour are included in the bases.

TABLE S46 (E/W61)

Type of drink by employment status at time of incident

Type of drink			EMPLOYMENT STATUS								Bases
			Manual	Retired	Unem- ployed	Casual or seasonal	Seamen	H.M. Forces	Other	No inf.	
Beer only	Scotland	%	64	2	18	3	2	4	4	3	3717
	E/W(X)	%	64	2	20	5	3	1	3	2	21377
Wine (incl. "wine" ciders perries etc.)	Scotland	%	34	4	44	5	1	*	6	7	5486
	E/W(X)	%	33	4	44	6	4	*	6	3	1703
Cider only	Scotland	%	35	3	29	8	0	0	7	17	39
	E/W(X)	%	32	2	44	16	1	1	4	1	376
Spirits only	Scotland	%	62	2	12	3	4	1	10	6	2932
	E/W(X)	%	45	2	20	6	9	2	11	3	1693
Methylisted spirits only	Scotland	%	4	8	75	3	1	0	3	6	111
	E/W(X)	%	10	4	76	5	1	0	1	3	317
Beer only spirits mixed	Scotland	%	70	2	12	2	4	2	6	2	11563
	E/W(X)	%	60	1	14	5	10	3	6	1	2632
Other mixed drinks	Scotland	%	59	2	27	3	3	*	4	3	6108
	E/W(X)	%	37	2	39	9	3	2	4	1	1484
Type of drink not known	Scotland	%	46	2	17	3	2	2	3	25	6326
	E/W(X)	%	53	2	22	4	5	2	5	7	5093
Total (all offenders)	Scotland	%	57	2	21	3	3	2	5	7	16072
	E/W(X)	%	54	2	22	5	4	2	4	3	34397

*less than 0.5%

were in full time manual employment at the time of the incident, and considerably fewer were unemployed or were casual or seasonal workers, or seamen (on shore leave). In summary:

Type of Drink

Proportion of drinkers who were:

			In manual employment	Unemployed, casual or seasonal workers, seamen
Spirits only	Sc	%	62	19
	E/W(X)	%	45	35
Beer and spirits mixed	Sc	%	70	18
	E/W(X)	%	60	29
Other mixed drinks	Sc	%	59	32
	E/W(X)	%	37	51

In each area the second group—the unemployed etc.—accounted for a similar proportion of *all* drunks charged ($29 \pm 2\%$). In Scotland they were heavily *under*-represented among drinkers of spirits, or of mixed beer and spirits; whereas in E/W(X) they were *over*-represented among spirit drinkers, and represented among beer and spirit drinkers in approximately the same proportion as they were among all offenders.

The unemployed etc. were over-represented among drinkers of other mixed drinks in both areas, but much more markedly so in E/W(X) than in Scotland.

These differences between area may well be no more than a logical outcome of the different drinking habits of offenders in general in the two areas.

Mixing ones drinks or drinking spirits only is popularly regarded as a way of getting drunk quickly. This is also true of cheap-wine drinking, and about half of those offenders who had drunk wine only in either area were in the unemployed etc. group. In E/W(X) there is substantial evidence to support the contention that the unemployed etc. offender tends more than others to have drunk the sort of drink, or mixture of drinks, which is popularly regarded as a means to quick intoxication. But in Scotland spirits—mainly mixed with beer—and other mixed drinks are far more commonly consumed by all offenders than they are in E/W(X). They are in this sense, more widely acceptable socially among drunks, and consequently the drinker who is in search of quick intoxication is much more likely in Scotland than he is in E/W(X) to find himself drinking the same beverages as other drunks.

It does *not*, of course, follow from the above that there is necessarily any difference between areas in the speed with which offenders in general reach the state of intoxication which leads to their being charged with an offence. This is likely to be a function of the quantities consumed rather than the type of drink, and we have no information about the former. But if an offender sets out to get drunk quickly he is far more likely in Scotland than he is in E/W(X) to drink beverages which are very commonly consumed by all drunks charged in the area.

(xiv) Medical treatment known to the Police

We have stated in Part I of this report that the information available about medical or psychiatric treatment of drunkenness offenders is likely to be very incomplete and unreliable. This is so because it was emphasised by police representatives in the planning stages of the enquiry that a police officer could not properly be required to question offenders about medical matters.

The proportions of offenders known to the police to have had treatment for alcoholism or any other nervous disorder were 2.9% in E/W(X) and 2.1% in Scotland. These figures are at best a minimal indication of the true proportions. It should also be born in mind that, in an inquiry covering 18 months, it is likely that a number of offenders who have had treatment will be charged more than once, and so be counted more than once in the totals.

IV CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT

(i) Time of Day

Table S47 compares for the two areas the times of day at which the police first intervened in the incidents which led to a charge.

The licensing hours for Scotland are fixed throughout the country under the Licensing (Scotland) Act 1962. They are: weekdays, 11 am to 2.30 pm and 5 pm to 10 pm; Sundays 12.30 pm to 2.30 pm and from 6.30 pm to 10 pm.

In E/W(X) permitted hours vary between licensing authority, and local Licensing Justices may make orders altering them. The most important difference between areas to bear in mind in evaluating the foregoing results is that permitted hours in the evening usually extend for half an hour longer (to 10.30 plus an additional ten minutes "drinking-up" time) in E/W(X) than they do in Scotland. But this is usually associated with a later evening opening time in E/W(X). Morning opening time tends to be earlier in E/W(X) than in Scotland.

Differences in permitted hours probably account to a large extent for the differences between area in the hourly, or half-hourly, distribution of charges, but there are certain differences which are not readily accounted for in this way.

Because of the difference in licensing hours, it was to be expected that the peak hour of the day for charges would be earlier in Scotland than in E/W(X). However incidents in the peak hour in Scotland—the period from shortly before 10 pm till shortly after 10.45 pm—accounted for a substantially smaller proportion of all charges (24%) than did the peak hour in E/W(X), which extends from shortly before 11 pm till shortly after 11.45 pm. Incidents in the two hours together led to 42% of all charges in Scotland, and 49% in E/W(X).

In Scotland charges arising from incidents at different times of day tended to be more concentrated into licensing hours and shortly after, and within licensing hours to be more widely spread over the period when public houses are open, than was the case in E/W(X). The proportion of charges originating in each of the three hours between shortly before mid-day to shortly after 2.45 pm was greater in Scotland than it was in E/W(X). Subsequently, up till shortly after 3.45 pm, there was little difference between areas. But a greater proportion of all charges in Scotland than in E/W(X) originated in each one of the seven periods listed in the Table between shortly before 6 pm till shortly after 10.45 pm*. Later, up till around 12.15 am, a much smaller proportion of all charges were originated in Scotland than in E/W(X); a difference no doubt directly derived from the effect of the different licensing hours, in clearing the streets of drunks earlier at night in Scotland. From about 1 am till about 11.45 am the hourly pattern was much the same in both areas.

*Other things being equal, a passer-by during these times of the evening and early night (when there are likely to be many people about in the street) is more likely to see an offending drunk in Scotland than in E/W(X). If the overall incidence of offences were the same in both areas, the drunkenness "problem" would be manifest to a greater proportion of people in Scotland than in E/W(X).

TABLE S47 (E/W62)

Time of day at which an officer first intervened in the incident leading to a charge
H8

Time span (hrs)	Time of Day (correct to nearest $\frac{1}{2}$ hour)	Scotland	E/W(X)
1	5.00—5.45 am.	0.3%	0.2%
1	6.00—6.45 am.	0.2	0.1
1	7.00—7.45 am.	0.1	0.1
1	8.00—8.45 am.	0.1	0.1
1	9.00—9.45 am.	0.1	0.1
1	10.00—10.45 am.	0.4	0.3
1	11.00—11.45 am.	0.6	0.6
1	12.00 (mid-day)—12.45 pm.	0.8	0.6
1	1.00—1.45 pm.	1.1	0.6
1	2.00—2.45 pm.	2.6	1.8
1	3.00—3.45 pm.	4.5	4.7
1	4.00—4.45 pm.	3.7	3.7
1	5.00—5.45 pm.	2.7	2.6
1	6.00—6.45 pm.	2.4	2.0
1	7.00—7.45 pm.	3.5	2.4
1	8.00—8.15 pm.	2.9	1.7
1	8.30—8.45 pm.	3.7	2.3
1	9.00—9.15 pm.	4.4	2.6
1	9.30—9.45 pm.	5.9	3.6
1	10.00—10.15 pm.	9.6	5.6
1	10.30—10.45 pm.	14.0	10.6
1	11.00—11.15 pm.	9.6	18.1
1	11.30—11.45 pm.	9.0	14.5
1	12.00 (midnight)—12.15 am.	4.6	7.8
1	12.30—12.45 am.	4.3	5.1
1	1.00—1.45 am.	4.9	4.9
1	2.00—2.45 am.	2.3	1.9
1	3.00—3.45 am.	0.9	0.9
1	4.00—4.45 am.	0.6	0.5
	No information	*	0.1
	Bases	36111	34642

*Less than 0.5%

The greater proportion of charges in Scotland which originated *during* opening hours, particularly during the earlier part of opening hours in the evening, appears to indicate that in Scotland more offenders get drunk earlier—i.e. they more rapidly get so drunk as to merit a charge. This is consistent with the differences in drinking habits between offenders in the two areas, in so far as it is easier to get drunk quickly on (for example) mixed beer and spirits than it is on beer alone. But this interpretation must be treated with caution since the present enquiry gives no indication of the amounts drunk. In any event it would appear that the drinking habits in Scotland and in England and Wales would repay further study.

Incapacity and time of day

Because of the differences in licensing hours it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons on any but a very broad basis between the areas in respect of the degree of incapacity of offenders charged as the result of incidents at different

times of day. Comparisons over the following wide time-spans, however, appeared likely to eliminate most of the effect of different licensing hours:

1. "Peak hours" for the origination of charges. These fall into two groups:
 - (a) the period between shortly before 10 pm and shortly after 11.45 pm. This period spans closing times in both areas, and is the single peak period in each area. The two hours concerned are the first and second peaks in each area (though the earlier hour is the first peak in Scotland and the later one in E/W(X)). The overall proportion of charges originating in the two hours together (Sc. 42%; E/W(X) 49%) did not differ very markedly between area.
 - (b) the following hour, between shortly before midnight till shortly after 12.45 am. This is the hour in which incidents leading to charges begin to diminish markedly. In both areas it covers a period some time after public houses shut (though the interval is longer in Scotland than in E/W(X)) and it provides a sub-sample of offenders which, in contrast to those originating from incidents in the two earlier hours, is not biased towards the period immediately before, during and after closing-time.
2. "Night". From shortly before 1 am to shortly after 4.45 am, when only 8 % and 9 % of charges originated in each area, respectively.
3. *Morning till before the end of evening licencing hours.* This covers the time from between shortly before 5 am to shortly before 9.45 pm. However, only about 1 % of all charges originated from incidents in this period prior to about 10.45 am. The period, then, broadly covers the time between the earliest morning "opening hours" till shortly before the earliest evening closing time. Morning and afternoon offenders will be included in this sub-sample as well as those whose offence occurred during evening opening hours. All of the latter will be included for Scotland, but because of later licencing hours, a considerable number will be omitted for E/W(X). However, in both areas the night-time influx of drinkers from public houses into the street is omitted.

Comparisons between this period and those described above will indicate whether or not offenders whose appearance in public is likely to be the outcome either of the proximity or recent passing of night closing time differ from others, and whether or not any such differences are common to both areas.

It was thought that the gregariousness associated with evening closing time might give rise to offences by persons less manifestly drunk than those involved in incidents at other times.

The results of the analysis are given in Table S48.

Although substantial differences between areas were found in the distribution over time of incidents leading to a charge this Table shows that over longer periods similarities were more in evidence than differences between areas in the relative degrees of manifest drunkenness shown by offenders.

The final columns of the Table show the distribution over the four periods considered of all offenders in each area. The remaining columns show these distributions for persons classified by the police in each of the four degrees of manifest intoxication.

TABLE S42 (E/W63, modified)
Time of Incident related to degree of incapacity

Time period	Degree of Incapacity								Total, all persons charged	
	Total or near- total incapacity		Lesser degree of incapacity		Incoherent only		None of these			
	Sc %	E/W(X) %	Sc %	E/W(X) %	Sc %	E/W(X) %	Sc %	E/W(X) %	Sc %	E/W(X) %
1. <i>Peak Hours</i>										
a. Shortly before 10 pm to shortly after 11.45 pm (covering end of licensing hours in both areas)	35	39	40	50	41	53	49	49	42	49
b. Shortly before midnight to shortly after 12.45 am	8	13	8	12	9	13	10	13	9	13
2. <i>Night</i>										
Shortly before 1 am to shortly after 4.45 am	7	10	9	7	11	9	10	9	9	8
3. <i>Morning till before end of licensing hours in either area</i>										
Shortly before 5 am to shortly after 9.45 pm*	50	39	43	31	39	25	31	30	40	30
Bases	10178	10071	7672	12553	3907	2934	14276	9007	36072	34497

*Note: Only about 1% of all charges arose from incidents taking place prior to the beginning of morning licensed hours in either area, and falling within this period.

Compared with the overall distribution:

- i In both areas the totally or nearly totally incapable were quite heavily *under*-represented among those whose offence occurred during the two main peak hours (which cover the end of licensing hours in both areas).
In Scotland 42% of all persons, but only 35% of the highly incapacitated charged/offended in incidents between these hours. The corresponding proportions in E/W(X) were 49% and 39%.
In Scotland there was a systematic tendency for the more capable to be the more heavily represented among those charged as a result of incidents in this period—the proportions ranging from 35% of the highly incapacitated to 49% of those offenders classified as neither incapable nor incoherent. In E/W(X) the contrast was only between the highly incapacitated and the rest.
- ii In both areas the most highly incapacitated were quite heavily *over*-represented among those charged as a result of incidents in period 3 (morning, till before the end of evening licensing hours).
In Scotland there was a systematic tendency, the reverse of that found during the "peak" hours, for the less capable to be the more heavily represented—the proportions ranging from 50% of the most highly incapacitated down to 31% of those classified as showing neither incapability nor incoherence. In E/W(X), again, the main contrast was between the highly incapacitated and the rest, though those classified as incoherent only was substantially *under*-represented in this period.
- iii In the hour from shortly before midnight, and during the rest of the night, drunks in different states of incapacity were represented in similar proportions to those found among offenders as a whole.

It is concluded that incidents in the peak hours around evening closing time less often involved very highly intoxicated offenders, and those during the day and before evening closing time, more often involved such offenders, than would be expected from the total distribution of offences originating between these times. This is true of both areas. But in Scotland there was a systematic tendency, which was not apparent in E/W(X), for representation during the peak hours to decline with each successive degree of manifest drunkenness, and to increase in the day and before closing time.

It is inferred that very drunken offenders tends to commit their offences before evening closing time. Offences by the less manifestly drunk tend to occur disproportionately around closing time. The trend is more marked in Scotland than in E/W(X). A purely hypothetical explanation is suggested: that the gregariousness associated with evening closing time leads to offences by persons who do not show the grosser signs of intoxication—and/or that those offenders who drink in order to get drunk tend to get drunk earlier in the day than do offenders in general. But, whatever the true explanation, these results serve to correct any popular misconception which associates the period around the evening closing time with a *disproportionately* large number of "flat-out" drunks appearing on the streets. The absolute number of offending drunks in this period is, of course, very large; but they include a smaller proportion who are "flat-out" than does the population of offenders as a whole. In Scotland the peak-hours tend particularly to be associated with offences by drunks who are neither incapable nor even incoherent.

(ii) Day of the Week

Table S49 shows the distribution of offences in each area over the days of the week:

TABLE S49 (E/W64)
Alleged offences taking place on each day of the week

Day of the Week	Proportion of alleged offences taking place on this day	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
Monday	$\frac{7}{6}$	$\frac{10}{7}$
Tuesday	6	7
Wednesday	6	7
Thursday	10	12
Friday	29	23
Saturday	34	30
Sunday	8	11
	} 63 %	
	} 53 %	
Bases	36111	34642

The pattern in the two areas is very similar. In both areas charges predominantly referred to incidents taking place on Fridays and Saturdays, with Saturdays predominating. But this concentration was greater (on both days) in Scotland than in E/W(X) with the result that nearly two-thirds (63%) of all charges originated on these two days in Scotland, compared with slightly over one-half (53%) in E/W(X).

In both areas charges fell off on Sunday to a level only 1% higher than Monday (7% Sc. 10% E/W(X)). In both areas incidents on Mondays and Tuesdays gave rise to the smallest number of charges (6-7% of the total per day); and there was a slight increase on Thursday (10-12% of the total) before the Friday-Saturday peaks.

Behaviour on Fridays and Saturdays

Table S50 shows, for each area, the proportions of all persons displaying each type of behaviour who were charged as a result of incidents taking place on Fridays and Saturdays. A similar Table, but relating to charges not behaviour, follows the discussion of Table S50. This second Table is likely to be the better indicator of the incidence of seriously offensive behaviour, and leads to some modification of the conclusions which might be drawn from the present Table.

Every single form of aggravating behaviour was more heavily concentrated into the Friday-Saturday period in Scotland than it was in E/W(X). Urinating and vomiting were the most outstanding example. 71% of those behaving in these ways in Scotland did so on Fridays and Saturdays compared with 51% in E/W(X). In Scotland the proportion of all offenders urinating or vomiting who did so on Fridays and Saturdays was considerably in excess of the total proportion of offenders charged on these days (63%); in E/W(X) it was slightly less than the corresponding total.

The two areas had the following characteristics in common:

- Offenders charged as a result of incidents on Fridays and Saturdays were more likely than all offenders to show some form of aggravating behaviour.
- In particular they were more likely to have shown some form of physical violence.

- iii They were less likely than offenders in general to have committed petty theft or minor fraud.

TABLE S50 (E/W65)
Behaviour of persons charged
Proportion of each type of behaviour occurring on Fridays and Saturdays

Behaviour	Proportion occurring on Fridays and Saturdays		Bases	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
13. No aggravating behaviour	59 %	47 %	13452	11600
1. Physical violence	70	61	6673	5634
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence	64	57	4608	4197
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	66	54	1707	8144
4. Insulting language or behaviour	65	54	11711	10958
5. Sexual behaviour	64	54	362	334
6. Obstructing the police (excluding verbal insults etc.)	65	57	954	2392
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	52	44	1112	431
8. Damage to property	61	55	1468	2322
12. Urinating, vomiting etc.	71	51	2496	2470
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	61	59	932	846
Total persons	63 %	53 %	36072	34597

The tendency towards threatening or aggressive behaviour without violence on Fridays and Saturdays, which was found in E/W(X) was only marginally apparent in Scotland, as was the tendency to obstruct the police.

Fridays and Saturdays were thus characterised by particularly active drunkenness among persons charged; by violence; and in Scotland by urinating and vomiting. In E/W(X) these days were also characterised by threatening, aggressive and obstructive behaviour.

The difference between Scotland and E/W(X) appears to lie at two extremes of behaviour—a predominance in Scotland of violence, but not of threats, suggestive of the active and most highly aggressive drunk; and, at the other end of the scale, the predominance of uriners and vomiters, suggestive of the passive drunk with minimal self-control.

Charges on Fridays and Saturdays

Table S51, which shows the proportions of each type of charge in the two areas originating from incidents on Fridays and Saturdays, modifies the impression given by the previous Table in some respects.

By comparison with the total proportions of offenders who were charged as a result of incidents on Fridays and Saturdays:

- i charges concerned with urinating or vomiting were over-represented in Scotland on Fridays and Saturdays, but not in E/W(X). This is consistent with behavioural differences described earlier.
- ii charges of possessing an offensive weapon were over-represented in both areas. While this is consistent with the tendency to use physical violence on Fridays and Saturdays, the absolute numbers of such charges against drunks in either area were small.

iii assault charges were *not* over-represented on Fridays and Saturdays in Scotland, though they were in E/W(X). Since such charges were, in Scotland, by far the most common of the charges associated with violence to the person it is reasonable to infer that although physically violent behaviour was more common in Scotland on Fridays and Saturdays than it was throughout the week, extreme violence of the sort that might lead to an assault charge was not.

It will be recalled that the greater part of the physical violence reported consisted of fighting within the drinkers own group (See Table S5). Fights of this sort would not be likely to lead to an assault charge in most cases. The prevalence of violent behaviour in Scotland on Fridays and Saturdays is probably a reflection of the prevalence of relatively innocuous fist-fights between drinking-companions rather than of serious assaults.

iv The over-representation in both areas of charges relating to the use of indecent or offensive language was not reflected in the overall incidence of insulting language and behaviour. This leads to the inference that the bad language of drunks tended to become more offensive on Fridays and Saturdays, though not more common.

It appears then, that the greater prevalence of violence which characterises Friday and Saturday is, (except at the extreme of possessing an offensive weapon), attributable to fights rather than serious assaults. Bad language tends to be worse on these days, but is no more prevalent.

TABLE S51 (E/W66)

Proportion of all charges of each type which were made against persons involved in incidents taking place on Fridays and Saturdays

Charge	Proportion which relate to incidents occurring on Fridays and Saturdays		Bases	
	Scotland	E/W(X)	Scotland	E/W(X)
1. Simple drunkenness	59 %	48 %	13970	12430
2. Breach of the peace only (Sc.)				
Aggravated drunkenness (E/W)	67	54	13382	16891
3. Breach of the peace (Sc.)				
Drunkenness (E/W) at the same time as another offence	63	57	2668	4272
7. Damage to property	60	54	1096	1855
12. Obstructing the police	65	58	906	1360
6. Disorderliness	62	59	368	1195
11. Indecent language	71	61	255	573
4. Assault	62	61	2988	337
8. Thefts	51	48	1036	198
5. Possessing offensive weapon	68	62	263	150
9. Urinating, vomiting, etc:	72	54	2045	142
10, 13, 14. Other charges	59	66	346	212
Total persons	63 %	53 %	36072	34597

Day of the week and degree of Incapacity

Table S52 shows the distribution over the week of offenders in the four different degrees of incapacity.

TABLE SS2 (E/W67)
Degree of Incapacity by day of the week

Degree of incapacity	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Sunday		Mean	
	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W	Se.	E/W
Total and non-treat incapacity	%	8	11	7	8	7	9	11	13	29	31	26	7	11	10178	10071
Partial incapacity	%	7	10	7	8	6	7	10	13	30	33	28	7	10	7671	12553
Incubent	%	7	9	7	6	6	6	11	12	30	32	33	7	11	3907	2842
Neither incapable nor incubent	%	6	8	5	5	5	6	8	12	29	37	33	9	12	14276	9607
Range for the four groups	%	6-8	8-11	5-7	5-8	5-7	6-9	8-11	12-13	25-30	31-37	26-33	7-9	10-12	39	32
No infection	%	7	10	6	7	6	7	10	12	29	24	30	8	11	31071	34597

On each day other than Saturday, in both areas, offenders in each degree of incapacity were distributed through the week in a very similar way. On Saturday the highly incapacitated were slightly under-represented, and the most capable were slightly over-represented.

Apart from Saturday, there was no day on which the representation of any one of the four groups differed by more than 2% from the total.

We do not, of course, know the true ratios of "flat-out" offenders to other offenders on different days. If these ratios were constant, the results would largely negate any suggestion that on the days when drunks are most prevalent the police may tend to overlook innocuous ones, who they might otherwise take into custody for their own safety, in order to concentrate on the many active ones. All that can be said is that the results lend no support to any such assumption for either area.

(iii) Place of Incident

Table S53 shows the places where incidents started in each area. In evaluating the results it must be born in mind that, because of the rarity of use of charges of aggravated drunkenness in Scotland, the terms of reference to which the Scottish police were working admitted the inclusion of some incidents taking place in private places which would not have made the offender eligible to a drunkenness charge.

If we examine the places of origin of incidents leading to each of the charges separately, it is apparent that the main differences between the two areas fall into two groups:

- i charges originating in public houses, which consistently form a smaller proportion of the whole in Scotland than they do in E/W(X). This applies to every single charge, but in some cases the results are affected by:
- ii the much higher proportion of certain charges which originated from incidents in the offender's home, and/or in miscellaneous buildings, doorways, gardens, etc. (which include, amongst other places, other dwellings and private property).

Point ii above holds for nearly every charge, the exceptions being possessing an offensive weapon in the offender's home (and urinating or vomiting—no such cases in the home), and using offensive language in miscellaneous buildings, doorways, gardens etc.

The most outstanding differences between area in this respect concern: (a) charges of assault, 41% of which in Scotland but only 7% in E/W(X) originated in the offenders home. The corresponding figures for miscellaneous buildings, doorways etc. were 17% in Scotland and 9% in E/W(X); and (b) charges of obstructing the police, of which 10% in Scotland and 3% in E/W(X) originated in the offenders home; 12% and 8% in miscellaneous buildings etc.

Theft charges (Sc. 24%, E/W(X) 15%) and charges of damage to property (Sc. 25%, E/W(X) 14%) also originated more often in miscellaneous buildings etc. in Scotland than in E/W(X).

In view of the inclusion in Scotland of some incidents on private premises which would rarely qualify for inclusion in E/W(X), it is impossible to make any firm direct comparisons between areas in relation to these results.*

*Note: Police were asked to record the place where each incident started, and to include with those actually taking place on private premises etc. any attempts to gain entry or re-entry to such premises, and incidents which originated in a dwelling even though the offender(s) were apprehended etc. outside it. We therefore have no precise index to the number of cases in which an offender was actually apprehended *inside* a dwelling.

TABLE S53 (E/W68)

Changes related to the place where the incident started

C

Place where incident started	Changes	1. Simple drunkenness only	2. Breach of the peace only (Se.)	3. Breach of the peace (Se.) Aggravated (E/W)	7. Damage to property at the same time as another offence	12. Disturbing the police	6. Disorderliness	11. Indecent language	4. Assault	E. Theft	5. Possession of offensive weapon	9. Littering, etc.	10. 13, 14. Other charges	
													146	312
Buses	Scotland E/W(X)	13182	2668	1096	1855	906	368	255	2844	1033	2045	346	146	
	Scotland E/W(X)	16891	4272	1360	1195	1260	1195	573	337	150	159	142	212	
	Public places													
	5. Street													
	8. Public transport													
	1. Public House													
	2, 3. Dance hall, club													
	13. Police Station													
	10, 11, 12. Other public places (used open land, sports grounds etc.)													
	4. Offender's home													
	5, 6, 7. Other buildings, doorways, gardens													
	14, 15. Other places and no information													

*Less than 0.5%.

It does appear, however, that charges originating from incidents in public houses are less common in Scotland than in E/W(X).

It is also noteworthy that, although certain specific charges in Scotland much more commonly originated from incidents inside the offender's dwelling, miscellaneous buildings etc. than they did on E/W(X), the overall differences in the incidence of such incidents were not so great as markedly to affect other results. 6% of all charges in Scotland and 2% in E/W(X) originated in the offender's dwelling; 8% in Scotland, and 7% in E/W(X), originated in miscellaneous buildings, gardens, etc. (which include among them all other private places in which a charge of aggravated drunkenness would be inapplicable).

Charges resulting from incidents which did not take place in the street

Table S54 is a summary table showing, for each charge in each area, the proportion of the charges which did *not* result from street incidents. It will be recalled from the previous Table that the overall proportions of charges arising from street incidents were closely similar in each area (Sc. 71%, E/W(X) 73%).

TABLE S54 (E/W69)

Proportion of charges resulting from incidents that did not start in the street

Charge	Proportion of such charges which resulted from incidents that did not start in the street			
	Scotland	E/W(X)	BASES	
			Scotland	E/W(X)
Simple Drunkenness only	%	%		
Breach of the peace (Sc)	10	17	13969	12430
Aggravated Drunkenness (E/W)	33	29	13382	16891
Breach of the peace (Sc.) Drunkenness (E/W) at the same time as another offence	62	47	2668	4272
Damage to property	59	51	1096	1855
Obstructing the police	41	41	906	1360
Disorderliness	51	53	368	1195
Indecent language	24	35	255	573
Assault	80	61	2988	337
Thefts	54	56	1036	198
Possessing offensive weapon	43	42	263	150
Urinating, vomiting etc.	24	16	2045	142
Other charges	56	40	346	212
Total (All Charges)	29	27	36072	34597

The following charges in Scotland considerably more often resulted from incidents which did *not* take place in the street than was the case in E/W(X):

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| A. Multiple charges in general | (62% Sc; 47% E/W(X)) |
| Assault charges | (80% Sc; 61% E/W(X)) |
| Damage to property | (59% Sc; 51% E/W(X)) |
| Urinating, vomiting | (24% Sc; 16% E/W(X)) |

Conversely, the following charges in Scotland less frequently resulted from incidents which did not take place in the street than was the case in E/W(X):

B. Simple drunkenness charges	(10% Sc; 17% E/W(X))
Indecent language	(24% Sc; 35% E/W(X))

The first three items in group A embrace charges which were, in a number of cases, admitted for inclusion in Scotland because of the different criteria which resulted from the very rare use of aggravated drunkenness charges in that country. No true objective difference in the behaviour of drunks can, therefore, be inferred.

Examination of Table S53 shows that the greater predominance of urinating or vomiting off the street is mainly accounted for by the greater prevalence of this form of behaviour in miscellaneous public places, open land etc. This result may well be an outcome of differences in geography rather than public habit. It should in any case be viewed with great circumspection because of the much higher incidence of this type of charge in Scotland than in E/W(X). Many such acts in Scotland would probably be hidden in a single charge of aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X).

The smaller proportion of charges of simple drunkenness in Scotland which originated off the street appear to indicate no very specific differences between area, but rather a generalised tendency not to bring such charges against drunks in other places (apart from open land, miscellaneous public places etc.). The tendency is consistent with the trend, noted elsewhere, for the simple drunkenness offender in Scotland to even more totally inactive than his counterpart in E/W(X).

The tendency in Scotland for charges of indecent language to originate less frequently than those in E/W(X) in incidents taking place off the street, again appears to be a general one, not related to specific localities.

(iv) The Officers who intervene in incidents leading to a charge

The rank, age and length of service in any police force of the officer who first intervened in each incident was ascertained. In Scotland the intervening officers tended to be of higher rank, to have longer service, and to be older than in E/W(X).

Table S55 compares the ranks of the intervening officers in the two areas.

TABLE S55 (E/W70)

The rank of the officer who first intervened in incidents leading to a charge

Rank of officer who first intervened	Proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which this was the rank of the officer who first intervened	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
Constable	88.0%	94.4%
Sergeant	10.1%	5.0%
Senior to above	1.5%	0.5%
No information	0.4%	0.2%
	11.6	
	5.5	
Base (persons)	36111	34642

In Scotland the first officer to intervene in an incident was twice as likely as in E/W(X) to be of the rank of sergeant or above (11.6% and 5.5%). (Officers above the rank of sergeant were, in fact, three times as likely to be the first to intervene in Scotland as in E/W(X)).

Table S56 compares the ages of the officers who first intervened in incidents in the two areas:

TABLE S56 (E/W71)

The age of the officer who first intervened in incidents leading to a charge

Age of officer who first intervened	Proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which this was the age of the officer who first intervened	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
19-21 years	4.9%	20.7%
22-24 years	13.2%	20.9%
25-27 years	14.5%	16.3%
28-30 years	16.3%	13.6%
31-40 years	37.4%	22.6%
41-50 years	12.4%	5.5%
51 and over	1.1%	0.3%
No information	0.1%	0.1%
Base (person charged)	36111	34642

In E/W(X) about one-fifth of the first officers to intervene were between the ages of 19 and 21 years, and a further fifth between 22 and 24 years (total under 25: 41.6%).

In Scotland, not only were there many fewer intervening officers aged under 25, but those within this age-group were predominantly in the upper part of it (4.9% aged 19-21; 13.2% aged 22-24).

Very many more of the first officers to intervene in Scotland were aged over 30 years (50.9%) than was the case in E/W(X) (28.4%).

Table S57 compares the length of service in any police force of the first officer to intervene in each of the two areas.

Officers with 2½ years service or less were the first to intervene in 34.7% of cases in E/W(X), but in only 11.9% of cases in Scotland. Within this group officers, with very short service (18 months or less) intervened first in 19.3% of cases in E/W(X), but in only 4.6% of cases in Scotland.

Officers with 2½ to 4½ years service were represented in fairly similar proportions in both areas, but above this length of service the intervening officer in Scotland tended to have had longer service in the police. The difference was particularly marked for those with over 10½ years service, who were the first to intervene in over a third of cases in Scotland (35.2%), but in less than a fifth of cases in E/W(X) (18.1%).

Clearly the intervening officers in Scotland tended to be older, more experienced policemen, often of higher rank, than those who intervened in E/W(X). This may account, at least in part, for the much smaller reported incidence in Scotland of all acts classified as obstructing the police. (See Table S5)

TABLE S57 (E/W72)

The length of service (in any police force) of the officer who first intervened in incidents leading to a charge

Length of Service of officer who first intervened	Proportion of persons charged as the outcome of incidents in which the first officer to intervene had this length of service—	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
Under 6 months	1.0	4.6
Over 6-12 years	3.6	14.7
Over 12-24 years	7.3	15.4
Over 24-34 years	10.2	11.4
Over 34-44 years	8.4	8.4
Over 44-54 years	6.9	6.1
Over 54-64 years	7.1	5.1
Over 64-74 years	5.6	4.3
Over 74-84 years	4.6	4.6
Over 84-94 years	5.1	3.8
Over 94-104 years	4.8	3.5
Over 104-124 years	7.0	4.6
Over 124-144 years	6.4	3.7
Over 144-164 years	5.2	3.5
Over 164-184 years	8.3	3.6
Over 184-204 years	4.4	1.7
Over 204 years	3.9	1.0
No information	0.1	—
Base (persons charged)	36111	34642

(v) Officers' duties at the time of intervention; how an officer came to be present; and behaviour related to the source of information about the incident

Table S58 compares the intervening officer's duties in the two areas at the time of the incident.

TABLE S58 (E/W73)

Officers' duties at time of incident

H		
Officers' duties at time of incident	Scotland	E/W(X)
Uniform patrol (foot or cycle)	63.3	60.8
Uniform patrol (motorised)	24.5	22.8
Traffic control	0.6	0.9
Plain clothes (not CID)	4.4	0.7
CID	0.7	0.6
Indoor duties	1.8	1.5
Supervisory duties (outdoors)	3.8	2.4
Off duty	0.3	0.7
Other duties	0.5	0.6
No information	0.2	0.1
Bases (persons)	36111	34642

In Scotland appreciably fewer of the intervening officers than in E/W(X) were on uniformed foot or cycle patrol at the time of the incident. But only very slightly more were on uniformed motorised patrol duties—so this is not an indication of an greater use of motorised patrols in apprehending drunks in Scotland.

The proportion of officers on plain clothes duties (other than CID) was 4.4% in Scotland, but only 0.7% in E/W(X). It is possible that this difference may be associated with approaching drunks in private dwellings (and therefore an outcome of a slightly different terms of reference used in the two areas rather than indicative of a true difference in directly comparable cases.)

The rather greater proportion of intervening officers in Scotland who were on outdoor supervisory duties is consistent with the higher proportion of senior officers in that country who were the first to intervene in incidents.

In general there is nothing in this Table which appears to reflect firmly any true difference between the areas in the initial dealings by the police with strictly similar cases.

Table S59 shows how an officer first came to be present at the scene of an incident.

TABLE S59 (E/W74)

How an officer came to be present at the scene

H

How officer came to be present	Scotland	E/W(X)
In course of normal duties	% 69	% 66
Called by manager etc. at place of incident	7	12
Called by member of the public, not personally affected	11	16
Called by member of the public complaining of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to own property, etc.	13	6
Offender gave himself up at police station	*	*
Bases (persons)	36111	34642

*Less than 0.5%

In about two thirds of all cases in both areas the intervening officer arrived at the scene in the course of normal duties.

In Scotland the proportion of cases in which the police were called either by management etc., at the place of the incident, or by a member of the public who was not personally affected were less than in E/W(X) (totals: Sc. 18%; E/W(X) 28%), but the police in Scotland were more often called by a member of the public complaining of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to own property etc. (13% compared with 6%).

There may be some confirmation here of earlier suggestions that the public in Scotland tend to be more tolerant than in E/W(X) of drunks who are merely a nuisance. But it must again be remembered that the terms of reference used by the police in Scotland admit charges against drunks in private dwellings, which we have shown often result in charges of assault. This difference could inflate the proportion of all cases in which the police are called by members of the public personally affected by an incident.

Table S60 relates the intervening officer's duty at the time of the incident to how he came to be present:

TABLE S60 (E/W75)

Officers' duty at the time of the incident in relation to how the police came to be present

How police came to be present at incident			Officers' Duty			Bases
			Uniform patrol (foot or pedal cycle)	Motorised uniform patrol	Other (not uniform patrol)	
In course of normal duties	Scotland	%	68	19	13	24959
	E/W(X)	%	78	15	7	22164
Called by management etc.	Scotland	%	56	33	11	2682
	E/W(X)	%	55	37	8	4274
Called by public, not personally affected	Scotland	%	53	37	10	4542
	E/W(X)	%	54	38	8	3376
Called by threatened member(s) of public	Scotland	%	47	41	12	3830
	E/W(X)	%	50	39	11	2217

This Table may be briefly summarised in terms of the use of motorised uniform patrols:

How Police came to be present	Percentage who were charged as a result of incidents in which a motorised uniform patrol on normal duties arrived first on the scene	
	Scotland	E/W(X)
In course of normal duties	19%	15%
Called by management, etc.	33%	37%
Called by members of the public not themselves affected	37%	38%
Called by threatened members of the public	41%	39%

This Table shows very little difference in practice between the two areas. In both areas motorised uniform patrols tend to be brought into action when an outside call is received by the police, somewhat more frequently when a member of the public complains of being threatened, and slightly less often when the call is from management etc., rather than a member of the public. Differences in the frequency with which mobile patrols were used in each of these three contingencies were very slight in E/W(X), marginally greater in Scotland.

Table S61 shows the behaviour associated with charges resulting from outside calls in the two areas.

In Scotland both management and the public (2% and 14%) were much less likely to report to the police the simple drunk who showed no aggravating behaviour than as the case in E/W(X) (7% and 25%). This is in line with other data which suggests that in Scotland people tend to be less perturbed by (or more indifferent to) harmless drunks.

TABLE S61 (E/W77)

Behaviour associated with charges arising from incidents
at which the police arrived as the result of an outside call

Behaviour	Proportion of cases in which the police arrived on the scene as the result of an outside call					
	Scotland			E/W(X)		
	From Management	From Public	Total	From Management	From Public	Total
13. No aggravating behaviour	% 2	14	16	7	25	32
1. Physical violence	% 17	43	60	31	19	50
2. Threatening or aggressive behaviour	% 14	35	49	21	28	49
3. General "public nuisance" behaviour	% 9	23	32	10	17	27
4. Insulting language or behaviour	% 10	26	36	16	21	37
5. Sexual behaviour	% 8	54	62	8	39	47
6. Obstructing the police	% 11	29	40	19	23	42
7. Petty theft and minor fraud	% 22	37	59	39	27	66
8. Damage to property	% 23	48	71	28	33	61
12. Urinating, vomiting, etc.	% 2	7	9	5	19	24
9, 10, 11. Other behaviour	% 10	37	47	16	27	43

The public (but not management) in Scotland were much more likely (43%) than in E/W(X) (19%) to call the police to deal with physical violence by drunks. This is consistent with the tendency for charges of assault to originate from incidents in the home in Scotland; the violence in these cases may well tend to be greater, and the difference between areas is probably more directly indicative of the different terms of reference used by the Scottish police than of true differences between the behaviour of drunks in the different areas.

All other forms of behaviour were more often reported by the public to the police in Scotland than they were in E/W(X). The result is compatible with two rather different explanations:

- i that the public in Scotland are more inclined to complain to the police about the same things in Scotland than they are in E/W(X)
- or ii that each form of behaviour by a drunk in Scotland tends to take a more extreme form than in E/W(X) before it is felt to warrant a complaint or a charge.

In deciding which of these explanations is the more likely to be correct, much emphasis must be laid on the far slighter reported incidence of "general public nuisance behaviour" by drunks in Scotland than in E/W(X). We have postulated early in this report that the true incidence of this sort of behaviour cannot be appreciably less in one area than another, and consequently that the comparative infrequency with which it is reported by the police from Scotland suggests a greater tolerance of the more innocuous signs of intoxication.

If this hypothesis is correct, then the second of the interpretations given above would seem more likely to be correct than the first. The threshold of tolerance

of drunken behaviour by both public and police would then be assumed to be greater in Scotland than in E/W(X). The behaviour of which the public complain in Scotland would represent more severe examples of behaviour of a type less readily tolerated in E/W(X).

* * * * *

In Table S62 the charges resulting from incidents reported to the police from outside sources are considered.

The interpretation of this Table is complicated by the fact that many of the specific (non-drunkenness) charges made in Scotland would form part of a charge of aggravated drunkenness in E/W(X). Certain points are free of this ambiguity:

- i Incidents reported by managements etc., result in smaller proportions of every type of charge in Scotland than they do in E/W(X). This confirms other suggestions that management plays a smaller part in Scotland than in E/W(X) in supplying the police with information leading to a charge.
- ii Unaffected members of the public comparatively rarely report to the police incidents which lead to a charge of simple drunkenness (13%), whereas in E/W(X) they more often do so (24%). This suggests tolerance of (or indifference to) the sight of the incapable drunk in Scotland.
- iii There is little difference between area in the distribution of the source of information from which the police hear of drunks ultimately charged with breach of the peace only (Sc.) or with aggravated drunkenness only E/W(X).
- iv Apart from simple drunkenness, urinating and vomiting, and indecent language every single charge more often originated in Scotland than in E/W(X) from an incident reported to the police by a member of the public who considered him/herself personally affected.

Point iv is amenable to two partly incompatible interpretations:

- (a) that in Scotland the public are more inclined than in E/W(X) to report the same sort of drunken behaviour to the police.
- (b) that drunken behaviour of the same type tends to be more extreme in Scotland than in E/W(X), and so more likely to force members of the public to complain to the police about it.

In the light of earlier data the second interpretation seems the more acceptable.

TABLE S62. (E/W78)
Charges in relation to how police came to be present at scene of incident

Charges	How police came to be present												Total
	In course of normal duties		Called by manager etc. at place of incident		Called by number of public not affected by the incident		Called by number of public affected by the incident		Offender gave himself up at police station				
	Scotland	E/W/Q	Scotland	E/W/Q	Scotland	E/W/Q	Scotland	E/W/Q	Scotland	E/W/Q			
Simple drunkenness only Breach of the peace (Sc.) Aggravated drunkenness (E/W) Breach of peace (Sc) Drunkenness (E/W) at the same time as another offence Damage to property Obstructing the police Disorderliness Indecent language Assault Theft	64	68	3	6	13	24	1	8	0	0	13869	12430	
	68	69	10	13	9	10	14	8	0	0	13382	16691	
	34	50	20	25	11	12	35	13	0	0	2668	4272	
	30	40	23	30	12	14	25	16	1	1	1096	1855	
	62	60	9	20	10	10	20	10	0	0	906	1560	
	49	44	21	37	12	10	19	9	0	0	363	1195	
	78	63	7	13	7	11	9	13	0	0	255	573	
	10	26	15	23	13	29	61	26	0	0	2988	337	
	41	46	21	29	15	15	23	11	0	0	1035	130	
	53	60	17	19	12	13	18	9	0	0	263	150	
Possessing offensive weapon Urinating, vomiting etc. Other charges	96	92	1	3	1	1	1	4	0	0	2045	142	
	56	59	8	16	26	12	19	11	0	0	346	212	
Total number charges	69	66	7	12	11	13	11	6	0	0	36072	34597	

*Less than 0.5%

INCIDENT REPORT (DRUNKENNESS)

(Scotland)

SERIAL N^o

POLICE FORCE
CODE NUMBER:

NO FORM IS REQUIRED FOR OFFENDERS AGAINST SECTIONS 6 & 11 OF THE ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1960, REGARDLESS OF ANY OTHER CHARGES THAT MAY BE MADE AGAINST THEM. FORMS ARE REQUIRED FOR OFFENDERS CHARGED WITH TAKING A MOTOR VEHICLE INTO USE WHILE DRUNK, WITH DRIVING AND DRIVING AWAY, EXCEPT WHEN THIS CHARGE IS ACCOMPANIED BY A CHARGE OF DRUNKENNESS NOT BROUGHT UNDER THE ROAD TRAFFIC ACT.

NAME OF POLICE STATION:

INCIDENT RESULTING IN ONE OR MORE PERSONS BEING APPREHENDED, OR REPORTED FOR PROSECUTION FOR:

- OR (a) An offence of drunkenness (with or without any other charge).
(b) Another offence or offence, if the alleged offenders conduct was clearly affected by drink AND one of the following conditions apply:—
EITHER: (i) A charge sometimes or commonly used as an ALTERNATIVE to one of drunkenness is made—(e.g. Breach of the Peace in Scotland; charges under By-Laws, such as Disorderly Behaviour, Consuming a Noxious, etc.)
OR: (ii) The person(s) concerned was/were likely to have been charged ONLY with an offence of drunkenness, with one of the charges described above and not with any other offence, had he been sufficiently intoxicated to match such a charge.

A. NUMBER OF PERSONS AFFECTED BY APPREHENDED OR REPORTED FOR PROSECUTION AS A RESULT OF THIS INCIDENT:

2	Witnessed in course of normal duties	1
1	Called by manager, etc. at place of incident	2
2	Called by member of public, not themselves affected by incident	3
3	Called by member of public complaining of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to own property, etc.	4
	Offender gave himself up at Police Station	5

B. DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT.

(a) Date ENTER NUMBERS ONLY
e.g. 15th Nov., 1964

Day of Week	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
Month	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Year	64	64	64	64	64	64	64

(b) Day of Week

1	Countable
2	Sergeant
3	Senior to above

(c) Time of Day

ENTER TIME AT WHICH AN OFFICER FIRST INTERVIEWED OR CHARGED THE OFFENDERS. GIVE HOUR, MINUTES AND SECONDS. MID-WAY BETWEEN QUARTER HOURS SHOULD BE ATTRIBUTED TO NEXT QUARTER HOUR FORWARD.

Use 24-Hour Clock e.g. 6.30 a.m. = 0630 p.m. = 1830

Hrs.	0	3	15
Min.	6	30	15
Sec.	0	0	0

C. DETAILS (a) Rank

1	Countable
2	Sergeant
3	Senior to above

(b) Officer's Duties at time of Incident

1	Uniform patrol (Foot or Pedal Cycle)
2	Uniform patrol (Motorised)
3	Traffic Control
4	Plain Clothes (Not C.I.D.)
5	C.I.D.
6	Station, office or other indoor duties (incl. supervisory or administrative duties)
7	Supervisory duties (Outdoors)
8	Off-Duty
9	Other Duties

(c) Officer's Main Duties in previous 6 months

1	Uniform patrol (Foot or Pedal Cycle)
2	Uniform patrol (Motorised)
3	Traffic Control
4	Plain Clothes (Not C.I.D.)
5	C.I.D.
6	Station, office or other indoor duties (incl. supervisory or administrative duties)
7	Supervisory duties (Outdoors)
8	Off-Duty
9	Other Duties

(d) Officer's Age (enter figures)

(e) Length of Service in (any) Police Force. (Enter to nearest year. If under 6 months, enter "G")

1	No one
2	IF MALES ONLY state number in figures
3	IF FEMALES ONLY state number in figures
4	IF BOTH SEXES state total no. of both sexes
5	No information

Tick the box one duty only applying most time.

D. HOW POLICE CAME TO BE PRESENT AT SCENE OF INCIDENT.

1	Witnessed in course of normal duties
2	Called by manager, etc. at place of incident
3	Called by member of public, not themselves affected by incident
4	Called by member of public complaining of personal insult, threat, assault, damage to own property, etc.
5	Offender gave himself up at Police Station

E. CIRCUMSTANCES OF INCIDENT (SEE NOTES BELOW ITEM (a))

(a) Place where incident started

1	*In Public House
2	*In dance hall (non-club)
3	*In club of any sort
4	*In dwelling where one or more of persons charged were living
5	*In other dwelling
6	*In other enclosed premises
7	In doorway or garden (incident NOT originating on premises or otherwise classifiable above)
8	At rail or bus-station or on public transport
9	In street (foot or roadway)
10	On open land (park, field, etc.)
11	Sportsground, or other place where games played
12	In any other public place
13	In Police Station
14	Elsewhere
15	No information

*INCIDENTS IMMEDIATELY OUTSIDE ENCLOSED PREMISES

Classify as starting in the premises—
(a) incidents where the offender gained entry or re-entry to the premises from a public place, private or public premises;
(b) incidents originating in a dwelling, even though subsequently occurring elsewhere;
(c) incidents in the forecourt, garden, etc. or immediately outside public premises (F—premises, forecourt or garden)
(d) incidents where the offender entered the premises or garden
(e) the persons charged, etc. came directly from such premises to participate in, or precipitate, the incident.

(b) Persons accompanying person(s) charged, at the time of incident. EXCLUDE ANY PERSONS CHARGED AS A RESULT OF THIS INCIDENT FOR WHOM DETAILS ARE ENTERED ON FORM.

1	No one
2	IF MALES ONLY state number in figures
3	IF FEMALES ONLY state number in figures
4	IF BOTH SEXES state total no. of both sexes
5	No information

(c) Did anyone suffer physical injury, or loss of personal property, as a result of the incident?

1	No
2	The offender(s) and/or their associates only
3	Relative, spouse or reputed spouse
4	Only complete strangers—members of the general public
5	Personal enemy(s) of offender(s)
6	Official(s) of any sort, other than Police
7	Police Officer(s)

SEE SEPARATE INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROCEDURE WHEN:

(a) MORE THAN FOUR PERSONS ARE CHARGED OR SUMMONED AS RESULT OF THE SAME INCIDENT

(b) ANY ONE PERSON IS CHARGED WITH TWO OR MORE OFFENCES OTHER THAN OFFENCES OF DRUNKENNESS.

F. DEGREE OF INCAPACITY AT TIME OF INCIDENT OF PERSON(S) CHARGED.

Each column represents one person. Tick in the list that applies.

PERSON	1	2	3	4
TOTAL OR NEAR-TOTAL INCAPABILITY. Fit out; unconscious or asleep; unable to remain upright without support.	1			
LESSER DEGREE OF INCAPABILITY. (Tick only if 1 does not apply). Tossing; staggering; supported by friend; supporting self against wall, etc., at intervals; dazed to self or others through stumbling into roadway, etc.	2			
INCOHERENT. (Tick only if neither 1 nor 2 apply). Heavily slurred speech; incoherent but inoffensive remarks addressed to strangers or to no-one in particular.	3			
NONE OF THE ABOVE APPLY.	4			

G. BEHAVIOUR LEADING TO CHARGE(S).

- (a) Tick and the facing page contains two blocks (A and B), each of four columns (1, 2, 3, 4). THE BLOCKS ARE DIVIDED BETWEEN THE TWO TYPES OF CHARGE WHICH MAY ARISE FROM THE INCIDENT — THE COLUMN(S) DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUALS CHARGED.
- (b) If only one person is charged with only one offence, then only Column 1 in the appropriate block has to be completed.
- (c) If two or more persons are charged, then Columns 2, 3 and 4 should be used for the second, third and fourth persons charged, respectively.
- PLEASE PUT A TICK AGAINST ALL DESCRIPTIONS ON THESE TWO PAGES WHICH APPLY TO THE BEHAVIOUR OF EACH PERSON CHARGED IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.
- THESE DESCRIPTIONS ARE THE SAME OFFENCES. THE SAME DESCRIPTION CANNOT APPLY TO MORE THAN ONE OF THE OFFENCES DISTINGUISHED CAREFULLY BETWEEN THOSE PARTS OF THE OFFENDER'S BEHAVIOUR WHICH LED TO EACH CHARGE, AND CHECK THAT THE SAME BEHAVIOUR IS NOT TICKED MORE THAN ONCE FOR ANY ONE PERSON.
- THE DOUBLE LINES ACROSS THE PAGE ARE MERELY FOR VISUAL GUIDANCE IN SEPARATING GROUPS OF SOMEWHAT SIMILAR BEHAVIOUR. MORE THAN ONE ITEM FALLING BETWEEN A PAIR OF DOUBLE LINES MAY BE TICKED, IF APPLICABLE.

"STRANGLERS"

INCLUDE AMONGST STRANGERS, EVEN IF KNOWN TO OFFENDER — OFFICIALS (OTHER THAN POLICE/CRIMINAL GROUP OR GANG), (b) PERSONAL ENEMIES OF RIVAL GROUPS.

ENTER PERSON NUMBER	BLOCK A Person(s) charged with offence of drunkenness				BLOCK B Person(s) charged with any other offence			
NO AGGRAVATING BEHAVIOUR (i.e. Incapacity or Inebriation ticked in item F above, and this was the sole reason for charge or summons)	1							
VOMITING.	2							
URINATING, defecating (Tick here unless deliberate act of indecent exposure to others is known)	3							
ROMANESQUE OR HORRORPLAY. Sporting, children, climbing, lamp-post, horizontally, amongst OWN group, not involving others except through noise, or obstruction prevented to himself.	4							
DELIBERATE OBSTRUCTION OF FOOTWAY (NOT Incapable) Miscellaneous pavement, forcing others to use roadway.	5							
DELIBERATE OBSTRUCTION OF TRAFFIC.	6							
PISHING, JOSTLING, BUMPING INTO members of the public	7							
UNSOLICITED REMARKS TO OR CONVERSATIONS WITH STRANGERS: ANNOYING, BUT NONOFFENSIVE IN THEIR CONTENT.	8							
INSULTING BEHAVIOUR. Addressing, insulting, derogatory or mocking remarks to strangers. (Not threatening or aggressive; not obscene)	9							
OBSCENE LANGUAGE CONFINED TO CONVERSATION OR SHOOTING AMONGST OWN GROUP.	10							
OBSCENE LANGUAGE DIRECTED TO STRANGERS or, in the case of solitary drinks, to no-one in particular.	11							
OBSCENE, IMPURE, OR OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE DIRECTED AT POLICE.	12							
THREATENING OR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (without actual violence) CONFINED TO OWN GROUP.	13							
THREATENING OR AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR (without actual violence) TO STRANGERS.	14							
FIGHTING OR PHYSICAL VIOLENCE CONFINED TO OWN GROUP.	15							
FIGHTING, PHYSICAL VIOLENCE, OR ATTACK ON STRANGERS)	16							
RESISTING ATTEMPT BY MANAGEMENT TO ELECT, REFUSE ENTRY to pub, etc., unless full or not premises other than private dwelling.	17							
REFUSING OR NEGLECTING TO PAY BILL, FARE, etc.	18							

		BLOCK A				BLOCK B			
		Person(s) charged with offence of drunkenness				Person(s) charged with any other offence			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
ENTER PERSON NUMBER									
19 ACCIDENTAL DAMAGE TO PROPERTY									
20 DELIBERATE DAMAGE TO PROPERTY									
21 THEFT OF "SOUVENIRS": jewellery; glasses; beacon glasses; notices, etc.									
22 SHOPLIFTING, including from street barrows, etc.									
23 POCKETPICKING OR OTHER THEFT FROM PERSON.									
24 OTHER THEFT FROM PUBLIC PLACE. Street café, pub, club, cinema. <i>Not involving</i> handling or entering with intent or subsequent intention of stealing.									
25 ATTEMPT TO RESIST ARREST.									
26 ATTEMPT TO "RESCUE" SOMEONE ELSE FROM ARREST.									
27 ATTACK ON POLICE OFFICER, NOT COVERED BY 25 or 26 ABOVE.									
28 ACCUSING PERSON OF SAME SEX AS OFFENDER.									
29 ACCUSING PERSON OF OPPOSITE SEX.									
30 INDECENT ACT WITH PERSON OF SAME SEX.									
31 INDECENT ACT WITH PERSON OF OPPOSITE SEX.									
32 INDECENT EXPOSURE (Not merely incidental to items 30 or 31, or to urination).									
33 DRUNK IN CHARGE OF CHILD.									
34 NEGLECT OF CHILDREN: LEAVING CHILDREN UNATTENDED.									
35 BEHAVIOUR NOT LISTED ABOVE (i) involving scolding									
36 (ii) involving violence to people									
37 (iii) involving damage to property									
38 (iv) involving sex									
39 (v) involving drugs									
40 ANY OTHER BEHAVIOUR NOT LISTED.									

H. CHARGES		PERSON				PERSON			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Simple drunkenness only				18. Breaking or attempted breaking	
2. Drunkenness with aggravations only				19. Shoplifting	
3. Drunkenness at the same time as another offence(s). (Tick here; also set the ONE offence for which details are given in the OTHER OFFENCE CONTINUATION SHEET)				20. Theft or attempted theft FROM motor vehicle	
4. Breach of the police				21. Theft of "baggage" (See item 21 in "G" above)	
5. Indecent assault				22. Other theft, without breaking, from enclosed premises or vehicles	
6. Assault on police				23. Theft from person	
7. Assault on spouse or relative				24. Failure to pay fare, bill for a meal, etc.	
8. Other common assault				25. Any charge implying only the offence of nuisance, violating or defecating (Committing a Nuisance; Indecent Behaviour; Urinating in Public places etc.)	
9. Any other wounding or assault charge (including ABH or GBH)				26. Gross indecency or any charge implying an indecent act other than those under item 25 (EXCLUDING indecent assault).	
10. Possessing offensive weapon				27. Indecent or obscene language.	
11. Disorderly or unruly behaviour (or similar offence against bye-law).				28. Obstructing police.	
12. Any other charge relating to fighting or violent conduct, without reference to physical harm to persons				29. Resisting arrest.	
13. Other charge relating to disorderliness				30. Facilitating threatening words/behaviour.	
14. Refusal to quit licensed premises; resisting attempt to eject; attempting to re-enter				31. Importuning; soliciting	
15. Molestation or wilful damage				32. Biting or committing intimidating liquor on licensed premises under age.	
16. Molestation mis. brief				33. Charge not listed above (Please state number of persons charged)	
17. Other charge of damage to property							

PERSON _____

PERSON(S) CHARGED		PERSON			
		1	2	3	4
(a) Age (enter figures)				
No information				
(b) Sex					
Male				1
Female				2
(c) Marital Status					
Single				1
Married				2
Widowed, divorced or separated				3
No information				4

K. CARRYING WEAPONS

Did the person(s) charged carry or use any sort of offensive weapon at the time of the incident?

	PERSON			
	1	2	3	4
at the time of the incident?				
Carried weapon, did not use it				1
Used weapon				2
Had on weapon				3
No information				4

(d) Country of Birth	England Scotland
-------------------------	---------------------

[illegible]

L. ALCOHOLISM: TYPE OF DRINK CONSUMED

(b) Is there evidence that the person charged has ever been under medical treatment for alcoholism, and/or has been treated or prescribed drugs for any nervous disorder?

Has been treated for alcoholism only	1
Has been treated for other nervous disorder only	2
Has been treated for both	3
No evidence	4

(b) Type(s) of alcoholic drink consumed prior to incident.

(e)	Place of Residence	Normally resident outside British Isles
<i>U</i>	<i>Widow</i>	Permanent resident in area of this police force
<i>to</i>	<i>Private</i>	
<i>rick</i>	<i>first</i>	
<i>live</i>	<i>only</i>	
		Temporary resident
		to area
		Resident outside area
		Vagrant; tramp; oo
		sited above
		No information

[illegible]

(1) Employment, etc., AT TIME OF

[illegible] 14. Was/were the offender(s) celebrating |

NOTE—INFORMATION ON PARTIES, etc. NOT HELD ON ACCOUNT OF ANY PARTICULAR OCCASION OR EVENTS NOT REQUIRED (TICK BOX 1)

Nerve, or more divulged			1
Specialist event			2
Wedding, birthday, christening, funeral or similar domestic event			3
Christmas, New Year or other occasional festivity			4
Other event (<i>describe below</i>)			5

1. NUMBER OF KNOWN PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS OR (SCOTLAND) FORFEITURES OF BAIL.

(Base answers on
your knowledge)

PERSON
(a) For offences of drunkenness

No information or once known					0
One or more known (order number known)	

(b) For other offences

No information or none known	1
One or more known (tick if applicable. Number not required)	2

DRUNKENNESS INQUIRY

INSTRUCTIONS ON COMPLETING "INCIDENT REPORT" FORMS (SCOTLAND)

1. WHEN TO COMPLETE AN "INCIDENT REPORT" FORM

With the three exceptions listed below, a form should be completed whenever anyone is apprehended or reported for prosecution for:

- (a) An offence of drunkenness (with or without any other charge).
- (b) Any other offence, IF the offender's conduct was clearly affected by drink AND the offence with which he was charged, or likely to be charged, was no more serious than one of drunkenness.

No form is required:

- (a) For offenders charged under Sections 6 or 11 of the Road Traffic Act, 1960 (regardless of any other offences with which they may be charged at the same time).
- (b) For those charged with Taking and Driving Away, EXCEPT when such persons are also charged with an offence of drunkenness NOT brought under the Road Traffic Act, or with a Breach of the Peace committed whilst under the influence of drink.
- (c) For military personnel handed over to military authorities after apprehension.

2. INFORMATION REQUIRED ON EACH FORM

Each form relates to a single incident. An "incident" may consist of steering a solitary incapable drunk to the Station; of apprehending several participants in a drunken brawl; of informing one or more persons, not sufficiently drunk to necessitate their being taken in charge, that they will be reported for prosecution; etc.

A single form allows space for a maximum of four persons charged as a result of one incident; and for a maximum of one charge of drunkenness and one other charge against each person.

The procedure to follow if more than four persons are charged, or more than one charge, other than a charge of drunkenness, is made against an individual, is outlined in Paragraph 5.

3. WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THE FORM

The first three pages of the form should be completed by the Senior Officer present at the incident, as soon as possible after the event. (If two or more Officers are present, and the Senior Officer arrived later than his colleague(s), he will, of course, consult other Officers present to complete the picture of what happened before his arrival.)

The back page, except for Section J (Previous Convictions), can only be filled in after questioning the alleged offender. If a drunk is apprehended and is not in a fit state to answer questions at the time, it should be completed by an appropriate Officer later. If a person when charged is not apprehended but reported for

prosecution, any information which can conveniently be obtained at the time of the charge by the Officer reporting him should be entered by this Officer. Any information not obtained then should be obtained, if possible, shortly before or after his appearance in court.

It is appreciated that it may be impracticable to obtain all the back-page information for persons reported; and that some persons apprehended may be unwilling to supply all of it. IN THESE CASES, PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE "No Information" BOX(ES). DO NOT LEAVE ITEMS BLANK.

4. HOW TO COMPLETE THE "INCIDENT" FORM

- i A tick (or, where stated, a number or series of numbers) should be entered in the appropriate box or boxes for each item of information required.
- ii Information in words is required only where specifically requested on the form, or when none of the cross-heads alongside the boxes are applicable.
- iii A box headed "No Information" is provided for all items on which information may, occasionally, not be available. PLEASE DO NOT OMIT TO TICK THIS BOX WHEN APPLICABLE. WE SHALL NOT OTHERWISE KNOW WHETHER A PIECE OF INFORMATION HAS BEEN ACCIDENTALLY OMITTED, OR HAS NOT BEEN OBTAINED.

iv Cover Page

- (a) Enter at the head of the form the name of the Police Station at which the offender was charged or reported for prosecution.
- (b) *Numerical Entries.* Instructions for making numerical entries are given on the form. Please make all numerical entries in figures, not in words. Do NOT use roman numerals in the date.
- (c) *Non-Numerical Entries.* Make a tick in the appropriate box for each item of information. There should be one tick only for each item.
- (d) *Item C.* Note that the details required here concern the Officer who first intervened in the incident. If two or more Officers deal with the incident, this may not be the Officer completing the form.

v Inside Pages

- (a) *Item F (Degree of Incapacity).* Each column represents one person. Regardless of the charge(s) against him, make one tick to indicate the degree of incapacity of each person charged.
- (b) *Item G (Behaviour leading to charges).* Keeping to the same person-number(s) as used in Item F:
 - 1. *IN BLOCK A.* For each person charged with an Offence of Drunkenness tick each of the descriptions of behaviour which apply in his case, IN RELATION TO THE DRUNKENNESS CHARGE. DO NOT tick in Block A any behaviour relating to another charge.
(Charges of Breach of the Peace should appear in Block B NOT Block A.
 - 2. *IN BLOCK B.* For each person charged with one offence other than an offence of drunkenness (whether or not he was charged with an offence of drunkenness as well), tick each of the descriptions of behaviour relating to that offence.

If any person is charged with more than one offence other than an offence of drunkenness, use CONTINUATION SHEETS for the second and subsequent other offences (see Para. 5).

- (c) *Item H (Charges).* Charges numbered 1 and 2: "Simple Drunkenness" means the charge of being found drunk in a public place, and includes the charge of being drunk and incapable. "Drunkenness with Aggravations" means a single charge of drunkenness which embodies a description of aggravating behaviour ("drunk and disorderly", "drunk in charge of a child"; etc.).

If charges 1 or 2 are ticked, this means that the only charge was one of drunkenness, and none of the subsequent items can be ticked.

If another charge or charges are made as well as a charge of drunkenness, tick Charge No. 3 ("Drunkenness at the same time as another offence") and also tick one other charge—the one you have described under Item G. If there is more than one other charge, use CONTINUATION SHEETS for additional charges.

If there is no charge of drunkenness, tick one charge—the one you have described under Item G. Use CONTINUATION SHEETS for additional charges.

vi Back Page

- (a) Notes on completion of the back page, which entails questioning the person(s) charged, have already been given in Para. 3.

Forms may be retained and included in the subsequent period's returns, if by so doing additional information for the back page may be obtained (i.e. principally when a person has been reported for prosecution during the first period, but the case has not been heard—so that there has been little or no opportunity to speak to him).

- (b) *Item I (f) (Employment).* A person is unemployed if:

- i He is entitled to unemployment benefit, but not sickness benefit, at the time of the incident.
- or ii He is sick, entitled to unemployment benefit, has no job awaiting him when he recovers, but will then seek one.
- or iii He has lost a job within 0 to 3 days of the incident, and has not yet found, or has not yet started work on, another job.

Manual Workers. Industrial and other manual workers, excluding all clerical workers and higher grades. If in any doubt as to whether a person should be classified as a "manual worker" or not, tick "Other" (Box 8) and describe the person's job.

- (c) *Item J. (Previous Convictions).* Here, and here only, include Breaches of the Peace committed whilst drunk amongst Offences of Drunkenness (i.e. in Part a).

If there is doubt as to whether or not any previous charge or charges of Breach of the Peace relate to behaviour whilst drunk OMIT THESE CHARGES ALTOGETHER FROM BOTH PARTS OF ITEM J AND NOTE IN THE LEFT HAND MARGIN HOW MANY SUCH CHARGES HAVE BEEN OMITTED.

- (d) *Item L. (b) (Types of drink consumed).* Ports, sherries and other fortified wines should be ticked "Other" (6) and described.

5. PROCEDURE WHEN A PERSON IS CHARGED WITH TWO OR MORE OFFENCES, OTHER THAN OFFENCES OF DRUNKENNESS, OR MORE THAN FOUR PEOPLE ARE CHARGED

i If a person is charged with two or more offences other than offences of drunkenness (regardless of whether they are also charged with an offence of drunkenness), use a CONTINUATION SHEET or SHEETS. Proceed as follows:

- (a) Copy the SERIAL NUMBER and the POLICE FORCE CODE NUMBER from the original form, and enter at head of CONTINUATION SHEET.
- (b) Enter the appropriate person number(s) in the blank boxes at the top of Block B—one column for each additional charge. Thus, if Person No. 1 is charged with two additional offences apart from those entered on the main form, and Person No. 2 with one additional offence, there will be two columns on a CONTINUATION SHEET for Person No. 1, and one column for Person No. 2.
- (c) Complete Sections G and H for each column, and pin the CONTINUATION SHEET to the original form.

ii If more than four persons are charged as a result of the same incident:

- (a) Complete a form for four of the persons charged.
- (b) Take another form. Delete the Serial Number, and substitute the Serial Number of the first form.
- (c) Cross through Page 1 of the new form.
- (d) Delete Person-Numbers at head of Section F, and substitute 5, 6, 7, 8, as required, for subsequent offenders after the fourth.
NO FURTHER ALTERATION NEED BE MADE. IN SUBSEQUENT ITEMS WE SHALL ASSUME THAT ENTRIES UNDER "PERSON No. 1" REFER TO PERSON NO. 5, etc.
- (e) Complete the entries for Pages 2, 3, and 4.
- (f) Pin the second form to the original one.

(Further additional forms should be used if more than 8 persons are charged as a result of one incident.)

CHARGES. In Section H the list of Charges is not intended necessarily to embody the wording of the charge. If the action with which a person is charged is described in the list, it should be ticked regardless of how the charge is actually worded.

Any queries regarding these instructions, or any difficulties met with in completing the forms, should be referred to: H. D. Willcock, Social Survey, Central Office of Information, Atlantic House, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.1.



SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Date of Issue

--	--	--	--



